XIII

BENGAL SECRETARIAT LIBRARY
HEAD
Received from
Scott Record Room
5 OCT 1914
Register Entry No. 1050

REPORT

OF THE

Legal Remembrancer to Government,

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH,

FOR THE YEAR ENDING 30TH SEPTEMBER 1893.

By The Hon'ble Mr. R. H. MACLEOD, C.S.,

Legal Remembrancer to Govt., N.-W. P. and Oudh.

Allahabad:

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH GOVERNMENT PRESS.

1894.

REGAL SECRETARIAT LIBRARY

REPORT

OF THE

Legal Remembrancer to Government,

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH

For the year ending 30th September 1893

No. $\frac{2772}{565}$

FROM

THE HON'BLE R H. MACLEOD, C. S.,

Legal Remembrancer to Government,

North-Western Provinces and Oudh,

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

North-Western Provinces and Oudh

DATED NAINI TAL, THE 11TH MAY 1894

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to submit the Annual Report on the civil litigation dealt with in the Legal Remembrancer's Office during the year 1892-93. On the 28th November 1893, the Hon'ble Mr. J Deas was succeeded in the office of Legal Remembrancer by the Hon'ble Mr. F Giles, and I relieved the latter officer on the 25th January last. The Hon'ble Mr Deas was in charge during the whole year under report, except for the period from the 29th December 1892 to the 29th March 1893, when the Hon'ble Mr Thornton was officiating for him.

2 In accordance with the instructions conveyed in the Government Orders on the Report for last year, a few additions have been made in the Appendices In the State and Municipal Statements, execution of decree cases have been distinguished by foot notes, as regards the Court of Wards, there being a large number of these cases, they have been shown in a separate statement but in the same form as the regular suits

3 Proceedings under the Land Acquisition Act and the values of cases compromised and withdrawn have been shown by foot notes where necessary

4 Proposals will shortly be made suggesting some slight alterations in the prescribed Forms for the Statements, with a view to making them clearer and more useful The inclusion at all of sums awarded as compensation in references under Act X of 1870 in the amount decreed in favour of the State, for instance, is very misleading

5 The number of cases of all kinds dealt with was 550 as against 529 in the previous year Of this number, 196 were pending at the close of the year Of the remainder (354 cases), 240 were decided in favour of and 80 against the State, Municipal Boards, or Court of Wards, while 34 suits were compromised or withdrawn

The amounts involved were as follows —

		Rs	a	p
Decisions favourable	.	7,01,917	8	1
Decisions unfavourable	.. .	4,95,446	2	2½
Compromised or withdrawn	... ..	1,38,077	11	9
Pending	. ...	12,91,478	3	11½
	Total ...	26,26,919	10	0

Of the unfavourable decisions, the value in one case alone was Rs 3,55,000 [see para. 7(10) below].

APPENDIX A.

STATE LITIGATION.

6. *Statement* No. I.—Government appeared as plaintiff in 41 and defendant in 62 cases, in all 103, including the six execution of decree cases noted in the statement, against 87 in the previous year. Of this number, 33 were still awaiting decision at the close of the year, 42 were decided in favour of and 15 against the State; of the balance, three were compromised and 10 withdrawn.

7 The following are the particulars of the 10 cases (excluding miscellaneous applications, applications for execution of decrees and references under the Land Acquisition Act) which were decided adversely to Government.

(1) *Muhammad Azim* versus *Secretary of State, Agra* (Rs. 500).—The plaintiff sued the Secretary of State to recover Rs. 500 and costs under following circumstances:—two men, Lal Muhammad and Ghaus Muhammad, had contracts from the Officer Commanding 21st Panjáb Infantry at Agra, for the repairs of the barracks. An advance of Rs. 500 (not a payment for work done) was made to the contractors. Muhammad Azim sued the contractors for money alleged to be due to him from them and applied for an attachment before judgment of Rs. 1,100, which was said to be in the Commanding Officer's hands, as due to the defendants for work done. It was contended that the work was not completed and therefore nothing was yet due. The Munsif accepted this view, but gave plaintiff a decree for Rs. 500, the amount advanced to the contractors. This decree was reversed in favour of the State on appeal (see statement No. II).

(2) *Sita Ram and Jaggan Nath* versus *Secretary of State, Mainpuri* (Rs. 3,326).—This was a suit to recover Rs. 3,326 earnest money paid by plaintiffs for the purchase of two villages (non-ancestral) on the ground that the sale was illegal, as it took place a day after the date fixed. The Civil Court accepted plaintiffs' contention and granted their application for the refund of the earnest money. No copy of the decision was sent to this office. It is clear from the previous correspondence that it was not a case in which Government should have been sued at all. All that was required was an application to the Civil Court for the refund of the money. As no costs were given against the State this is presumably the view the Civil Court took of the matter.

(3) *Mr. A. G. Sheen* versus *Secretary of State, Bijnor* (Rs. 7,538-2-9).—This was a suit against the Oudh and Rohilkand Railway Administration for damages on account of the rescission of a contract. The facts briefly are:—in December 1888, or January 1889, plaintiff purchased the iron roofing of certain sheds at the Balawali Station for Rs. 2,797-10-6 and paid the price of the same, after it had been measured and valued by the Railway Authorities. No mention was made at that time between the contracting parties about removing the iron within a fixed period or by a specified date; but subsequent to payment by plaintiff in full, the Engineer-in-Chief informed him that he must remove all the iron by 25th August 1889, otherwise he would take possession of any remaining unremoved. To this the plaintiff objected, stating that the terms of the contract finally agreed to could not now be altered. It would appear that when the terms of the contract had been agreed to, but before payment of the purchase money had been made by plaintiff, he was put in possession of the iron roofs, but by mutual agreement between himself and the Railway Administration he did not then remove any of the iron, as in some of the sheds of which it formed the covering there were engines, plant, stores, &c., some of which remained until July 1889. The plaintiff afterwards removed part of the iron, but on or about the 25th August 1889 the Railway Administration rescinded the contract of sale, seized the whole

of the unremoved portion of the iron roofing and returned to plaintiff the sum of Rs. 3,092-2-9 as its value, which amount he accepted in part payment, still claiming a balance of Rs. 6,079-2-9 as damages, and Rs. 1,459 as interest. The Railway Administration, acting on the advice of the Hon'ble Mr. Knox, refused to recognise liability of any kind or to pay the bill presented by the plaintiff, but when the Hon'ble Mr. Deas came to deal with the case, he advised a compromise; and though the plaintiff expressed his willingness to come to an amicable settlement, the Railway Administration was not so disposed. The case was accordingly proceeded with and was decided against the State by the Sub-Judge of Moradabád, who held that the removal by a particular date of the material sold was not an essential part of the contract. He decreed plaintiff's claim to the extent of Rs. 6,040-14-9 (excluding the sum of Rs. 3,092-2-9 received in part payment), but dismissed his claim to interest. The Railway Administration considered the damages awarded excessive, and though the then Legal Remembrancer, the Hon'ble Mr. Thornton, thought that the expense of appealing would probably swallow up more than any sum likely to be gained by a reduction of the damages awarded by the Lower Court, the Railway Administration decided upon taking the case to the High Court. The appeal was accordingly filed and is now pending.

(4) *Surjan Mal* versus *Secretary of State, Benares* (Rs. 431-7-0).—This was a claim in the Small Cause Court, brought against the Oudh and Rohilkand Railway Administration for Rs. 431-7-0, damages to plantiff's consignment of grain despatched from Sahibganj, East Indian Railway, to Benares Cantonment Station (Oudh and Rohilkand Railway). The Court held that the grain had been damaged owing to the Railway Administration not taking ordinary care of it, and decreed plaintiff's claim for Rs. 290-4-9 with proportionate costs.

(5) *Musammat Lalita Bahu* versus *Agent, Governor-General, Benares* (Rs. 659-14-0).—This was a suit against the Agent, Governor-General, as guardian of the ward Narpat Singh, for recovery of Rs. 522-10-0 and Rs. 137-4-0 interest. The plaintiff alleged that the late Rája Arjun Singh (father of the minor ward) had purchased from her firm cloths valued at Rs. 622-10-0 and had signed a *sarkhat* in acknowledgment of the said debt; that subsequently he paid Rs. 100, and that the amount now sued for was still due. The claim was contested mainly on the ground that Narpat Singh had received no assets from his father. The Munsif decreed plaintiff's claim for Rs. 522-10-0 only, with proportionate costs and future interest at Rs. 6 per cent. per annum, and held that the defendant would not be liable personally; the decree being capable of execution only against the assets (if any) of the late Rája in the hands of the defendant.

(6) *Ram Khilawan* versus *Collector, Benares*.—This case appears not to have been referred to the Legal Remembrancer. All that can be gathered from the returns submitted is that this was an application for the appointment of a guardian, which was granted conditionally, and as it was held that the Collector was justified in having taken action, the parties were left to pay their own costs.

(7) *Rahim Chaudhri* versus *Sahai Pande and others, and the Secretary of State, Basti* (Rs. 2,433-5-4½).—This was a suit for the redemption of a mortgage. The Secretary of State was merely added as a formal co-defendant as representing one of the original parties to the mortgage; but Government had no real concern with the suit and no costs were awarded against the State.

(8) *Bulaki Das* versus *Deputy Commissioner, Lucknow* (Rs. 9).—This was a claim for Rs. 9 against the estate of a deceased person, his property being in the Deputy Commissioner's hands as unclaimed intestate property. The case was decided against the State by the Judge of the Small Cause Court. Several points of law are involved, and an application for revision of this order has been filed in the Court of the Judicial Commissioner.

(9) *Husan Teli* versus *Secretary of State, Sitapur.*—This was a suit for declaration of right to the possession of an *Imambara* site in Khyrabad. The Deputy Commissioner apparently prohibited the plaintiff from placing his *tazia* on the land in dispute, and the claim was that the plaintiff had a right to place his *tazia* there. The defence set up was that the plot containing the "ruins of an Imambara" had been unoccupied waste ground for the last 40 years or so; that the plaintiff had not been in possession within the period of limitation; that for the last 40 years or so no *tazias* had been placed there, and further that the question of allowing *tazias* to be placed on that land was one which must, from time to time, be dealt with by the District Magistrate with regard to the state of the religious feeling between Hindus and Muhammadans in the town. The suit was first brought against the Municipal Board of Khyrabad, but was dismissed on the ground that the land was Government property. The plaintiff accordingly sued the State and won his case in the Lower Court. An appeal has been filed and is still pending in the Court of the District Judge, Sitapur.

(10) *Inayat-ullah* versus *Secretary of State, Bahraich* (claim Rs. 3,55,000).—This case was noticed in the Report for last year, paragraph 12, page 5. A decree was given in plaintiff's favor by the Sub-Judge, Bahraich. An appeal has now been filed in the Judicial Commissioner's Court. The case has from the commencement been in the hands of Mr. Chamier, Barrister-at-Law, whose services were retained under G. O. No. $\frac{189}{111-487-B}$, dated 28th June 1892.

8. Subjoined is an explanation of the three cases shown as compromised by the State:—

(1) *Pandit Ganga Ram* versus *Secretary of State, Meerut* (Rs. 160).—In this suit plaintiff claimed Rs. 160, 16 months' rent for two of his godowns, which had been used for storing grain which had been seized by the order of the Criminal Court. The claim of Ganga Ram was a just one, and a Civil Court, no doubt, would have taken that view. The suit was accordingly, on the advice of the Legal Remembrancer, compromised by paying the plaintiff Rs. 100. The first intimation this office received of the claim was that the plaint had been filed.

(2) *Pershad Lal* versus *Secretary of State, Meerut* (Rs. 10).—In this suit plaintiff claimed to be proprietor of a plot of land and a tree, and also that he was entitled to cut the tree down. He based his claim on the ground that Government had not paid any compensation for this land, and that on a former occasion he was allowed to remove the wood of a withered tree from it. Further particulars were asked for from the Collector and he reported that, after going through the old settlement and other papers, he was of opinion that the claim was a proper one and it was impossible to defend the suit. It was accordingly compromised. The first intimation received by this office in this case also was that the plaint had been filed.

(3) *Chattar Pal Singh* versus *Secretary of State, Moradabad* (Rs. 30-9-6).—The suit was against the Executive Engineer of the B. R. M. Railway for Rs. 30-9-6, on account of arrears of a bill said to be due on a contract

for carrying bricks. The claim being a petty one and apparently well-founded, the Collector in consultation with the Executive Engineer advised a compromise. The case was not reported to this office till after the compromise had been effected.

9. *Statement No. II.*—Sixteen suits were before the District Courts in appeal. In four appeals the Secretary of State was appellant and in 12 respondent : 14 of these cases were decided. Of the four appeals in which the Secretary of State appeared as appellant, one is still pending ; in one the State was successful and in two unsuccessful ; of the 12 in which the Secretary of State was respondent, one is still pending, and 10 were decided in favour of, and one against the State.

10. The following are the particulars of the appeals lost :—

(1) *Government, defendant-appellant*, versus *Alim-ullah, plaintiff-respondent, Agra* (Rs. 49).—This case was noticed in last year's Report, paragraph 7 (2), page 2.

(2) *Secretary of State, defendant-appellant*, versus *Khankai Lal, plaintiff-respondent, Lucknow* (Rs. 67).—This case was noticed in last year's Report, paragraph 7 (5), page 2. The Sub-Judge in appeal held that as the name of the respondent was entered in the *khasra* as proprietor, the property belonged to him and that the State had no right to it.

(3) *Ram Dat, plaintiff-appellant*, versus *Secretary of State, defendant-respondent, Bahraich* (Rs. 49-7-0).—An account of this case appears in last year's Report, paragraph 7 (6), page 3. The appeal was against the order awarding costs against the appellant. The District Judge held that the Forest authorities had no right to keep the timber altogether, and on this ground the appeal was decreed.

11. *Statement No. III (cases before Privy Council, &c)*.—These were in all nine as against 12 in the previous year. Two were decided against the State and seven are still pending.

The two appeals lost were :—

(1) *Secretary of State, plaintiff-appellant*, versus *Basantu, defendant-respondent, Benares* (*Rs.* 5,094).—This case was noticed in paragraph 1 of the Report for the year ending 30th September 1889. The appeal was dismissed by the High Court mainly on the ground that the map and *khasra* on the deed executed in favor of the Collector, Benares, did not include the well and temple which occupy part of the land claimed by Government.

(2) *Muhammad Aziz-ud-din Ahmad Khan, defendant-appellant*, versus *the Secretary of State, plaintiff-respondent, Moradabad* (*Rs.* 6,000).—This was a suit brought against the appellant by the Legal Remembrancer to Government, North-Western Provinces and Oudh, under the powers vested in him by section 539 of the Civil Procedure Code. The facts of the case are briefly :—the father (deceased) of Aziz-ud-din Khan made over certain property by a deed to the appellant and others, whom he appointed trustees with instructions to distribute Rs. 90 out of the income amongst the poor and destitute. That four years after this Aziz-ud-din and the other co-trustees ceased to distribute the money held in trust as directed. That when they were asked for accounts they produced a statement which, on enquiry, was found to contain items that were false and incorrect. The District Judge of Moradabad held that the appellant and the other co-trustees were not fit persons to continue as trustees ; that they were guilty of breach of trust in not having devoted the income to the charitable purposes specified in the trust deed ; and the Court directed that Aziz-ud-din who had had sole control of the trust property should pay

all the costs incurred in the suit Against this order Aziz-ud-din appealed to the High Court The High Court held that the whole transaction so far as the author of the trust was concerned was a paper one only, and had never taken effect inasmuch as the income of the property had never been employed for the declared purpose, and the appropriator had retained exclusive proprietary possession, which possession passed by inheritance under Muhammadan law to his two sons, the defendants, and that there never was a valid endowment, but only an inchoate one, which stopped short at the written and registered declaration of the defendant's father, from which he had receded before he had put it out of his power to do so by divesting himself of the property On these grounds the appeal was allowed and the decree of the Lower Court set aside with costs

12 The results of the year are given in the subjoined table—

Government	State plaintiff or appellant	State defendant or respondent	Total	For the State	Against the State	Pending	Percentage in favour of the State
Courts of First Instance	41	62	103	42	15	33	73
District Courts of appeal	4	12	16	11	3	2	78
High Court do	4	5	9		2	7	
Total	49	79	128	53	20	42	72

13 *Statement No IV* —The total amount due to the State, including Rs 2,341-5-4 awarded during the year, amounted to Rs 21,041 5-7 Of this sum Rs 3,021-2-10 or 14 per cent was realized, a result which is an improvement on that of the previous year (10 per cent.), Rs 9,588-13-1 was remitted, this sum includes Rs 8,297-15-1, which was shown as due from Major General Thelwal and removed from the accounts under G O No $\frac{237}{VII-481B}$, dated 27th March 1893 The year closed with an outstanding balance of Rs 8,431-5-8, of which Rs 1,349-0-6, is reported irrecoverable

The largest balances are in the following districts —

	Rs	a	p	
North Western Provinces				
(1) Etah	2 544	8	6	(recoverable)
(2) Allahabad	2 105	14	6	(2 042 7 6 recoverable, 63 7 0 irrecoverable)
(3) Agra	886	8	0	(irrecoverable)
Oudh				
(4) Bara Banki	205	0	0	(recoverable)

(1) *Etah* —Steps are being taken for the recovery of this balance judgment-debtor's property has been attached

(2) *Allahabad* —Rs 40-7-6 was realized after the close of the year under report Rs 63-7 0 was found to be irrecoverable and the balance Rs 2,002, as noticed in last year's Report, is due from the claimants of the Khargapur estate.

(3) *Agra* —The balance is due from Messrs. Cripps and Beddy and was noticed in last year's Report No property belonging to Mr Beddy has been traced up to date. There is, consequently, very little hope entertained of the recovery of the amount due from him.

(4) *Bara Banki* —This balance is due from Bhup Narain, whose case was noticed in the Report for the year ending 30th September 1891 His appeal has been decided and the amount payable by him (originally Rs 631-12-0) has now been reduced by the Appellate Court to Rs 205

* Three cases were compromised and 10 withdrawn in which State was defendant.

14. *Statement No. V.*—The amount spent by the State in its litigation was Rs. 4,798-12-2, of which Rs. 1,652-7-3 was decreed against it in regular suits. The amount realized was Rs. 3,021-2-10. This item, as usual, includes costs which were awarded in previous years but recovered during the year under report.

The highest expenditure appears in the following districts :—

		Rs.	a.	p.
1.	Sháhjahánpur	772	6	6
2.	Benares	654	13	1
3.	Dehra Dún	565	12	8
4.	Bahraich	485	14	3
5.	Gorakhpur	266	6	6
6.	Cawnpore	260	15	6
7.	Saháranpur	212	11	0
8.	Kheri	200	12	0

(1) *Sháhjahánpur.*—The greater portion of this charge, *viz*, Rs. 685-2-0, was expended in defending the case and the appeal in the High Court brought by Jwala Sahai against the Secretary of State. The claim is valued at one lakh.

(2) *Benares.*—Rs. 568-10-1 was paid in satisfaction of the decree against the State in the case of Basantu noticed in paragraph 11 (1) and the balance in prosecuting and defending 18 cases.

(3) *Dehra Dún.*—The greater portion of this charge, *viz*, Rs. 488-12-8, was paid as compensation in three references under Act X of 1870. The balance, Rs. 77, was the law charges incurred in these cases.

(4) *Bahraich.*—The greater portion of this charge, *viz*, Rs. 454-4-9, was expended in the Sayyid Salar shrine case, which was decided against the State and is now pending in appeal before the Judicial Commissioner of Oudh.

(5) *Gorakhpur.*—Rs. 27-3-6 was expended in prosecuting one reference under Act X of 1870 and Rs. 210 in one appeal in the High Court, which is still pending. The balance, Rs. 29-3-0, was paid in a reference under Act X of 1870, which was decided against Government.

(6) *Cawnpore.*—The greater portion of this charge, *viz*, Rs. 229-9-6, was paid in satisfaction of the decree against Government, in the case "Ramjiwan *versus* Secretary of State," which was noticed in paragraph 5 (10 and 11), page 3 of the Report for the year ending 30th September 1891.

(7) *Saháranpur.*—Rs. 29-7-0 was deposited in Court for plaintiff and Rs. 25 were spent in defending the case "Mahant Balwantgir *versus* Secretary of State" and Rs. 42-4-0 in prosecuting the case "Secretary of State *versus* Moti Lal."

(8) *Kheri.*—Rs. 200-12-0 was expended in prosecuting the case against Thakur Gobardhan Singh for possession of 588 bighas 1 biswa of land and Rs. 300 mesne profits. This case was won by Government (*vide* paragraph 12 (3) of last year's Report).

APPENDIX B.

Municipal Board Litigation.

15. *Statement No. I.*—Municipal Boards were involved in 51 cases, including four execution of decree cases noted in the statement, as against 34 in the previous year. Of these 20 were decided in favour of and nine against the Municipal Boards concerned. Five cases were compromised, one withdrawn and 16 are still pending.

16. Of the nine cases decided adversely to the Boards concerned, the three suits brought against the Lucknow Municipality and decreed against it were not reported to the Legal Remembrancer. The particulars of the remaining six cases are as follows :—

(1) *Nabi Bakhsh and Ali Bakhsh* versus *Sahâranpur Municipal Board* (Rs. 40).—This was a claim for the proprietary possession of a strip of land alleged to have been formerly occupied by the plaintiff's *chabutra*. In the absence of any evidence to show what the original width of the *chabutra* was, the Munsif gave the plaintiffs a decree for a strip of land one yard in width along the front of their house, with proportionate costs. The Hon'ble Mr. Deas did not on the above facts advise an appeal. The plaintiffs have, as reported by the Chairman, filed an appeal against the order of the Munsif dismissing a portion of their claim. The Municipality have in turn filed an objection under section 561 of the Civil Procedure Code.

(2) *Jumna Das* versus *Muttra Municipal Board* (Rs. 49) and,

(3) *Fakir Chand* versus *Muttra Municipal Board* (Rs 40).—These were claims against the Board for refusing to grant permission to rebuild the wall of a house, and to construct a latrine and drain, and with regard to an order for the removal of a door, respectively. The claim of Jumna Das was partly decreed and partly dismissed, and that of Fakir Chand decreed.

(4) *Hari Brahman* versus *Brindaban Municipal Board* (Rs. 49).—This was a suit against the order of the Board directing the removal of a house and latrine built by the plaintiff. The Munsif held that no public nuisance was caused by the plaintiff and decreed his suit with costs. The Legal Remembrancer did not advise an appeal against this order.

(5) *Pyarey Lal* versus *Badaun Municipal Board* (Rs. 10).—This was a suit against the order of the Board closing the door of plaintiff's private latrine. Plaintiff's claim was decreed.

(6) *Madho Pershad* versus *Allahabad Municipal Board* (Rs. 100).—This was a claim for the recovery of the proprietary possession of land attached to plaintiff's *chabutra*. The greater portion of the claim was dismissed, and against this order the plaintiff appealed. The Sub-Judge upheld the decree of the Lower Court.

17. *Statement No. II.*—In the District Courts Municipal Boards were parties to 15 appeals. Of this number 10 (one in which they were appellants and nine in which they were defendants), were decided, all in favour of the Boards concerned, and five appeals are still pending.

18. *Statement No. III.*—The Municipal Boards of Manipuri and Jaunpur each appealed one case to the High Court. The one by the Jaunpur Municipal Board was unsuccessful. This appeal was against an injunction which the respondent had obtained in the Lower Appellate Court against the Municipal Board prohibiting the Board from interfering with respondent's *ghûr* (place for accumulating sweepings, &c.). The Board appealed to the High Court against the advice of the Legal Remembrancer and lost their case.

Lucknow was the only Oudh Municipality which had appeals in the District Courts and no Oudh Municipalities had any appeals in the Judicial Commissioner's Court.

19. Out of 41 cases and appeals decided Municipal Boards were successful in 31 or 75 per cent. and six others were compromised or withdrawn.

20. *Statement No. IV.*—Out of a total sum of Rs. 5,924-13-6, due and outstanding, the Boards recovered Rs. 882-6-10 or 15 per cent. as against 10 per cent. in the previous year. The year closed with a balance of Rs. 5,042-6-8, of which Rs. 1,356-7-0 are reported irrecoverable and Rs. 985-9-2 as doubtful. The Legal Remembrancer has little or no control over the realization of the amounts due under decrees in favour of Municipal Boards.

21. The heaviest balances appear against the Cawnpore and Benares Municipal Boards. In the case of the former Rs. 814-0-4 is reported irrecoverable and the balance Rs. 156-12-0 has been deposited in Court. In that of the latter the irrecoverable amount Rs. 237-13-8 is due from one Manna Ahir, who is reported to be dead. The doubtful balance Rs. 985-9-2 is due from one Matai Singh, who cannot at present be traced.

22. *Statement No. V.*—The receipts from litigation were Rs. 882-6-10, the expenditure Rs. 2,723-15-5.

APPENDIX C.

Court of Wards Litigation.

23. *Statement No. I.*—There were 265 cases (including 123 miscellaneous applications) or four less than in the previous year, in which the Court of Wards was a party, being plaintiff in 165 and defendant in 100. Compared with the previous year the returns show the same number of cases in the North-Western Provinces and a decrease of four in Oudh.

24. Excluding the 123 applications which appear in Statement No. 1 (2) and which will be treated separately, the Court of Wards was a party to 142 suits; of this number 101 suits were decided, 34 in the North-Western Provinces and 67 in Oudh. Of the 34 suits decided in the North-Western Provinces, 26 were in favour of and three adverse to the estates concerned; the remaining five were compromised. In Oudh 45 of the 67 suits were decided in favour of and 14 against the Court of Wards; three were compromised and five withdrawn. 41 suits were still pending at the close of the year.

25. The following is an account of the 17 cases lost by the Court of Wards, North-Western Provinces and Oudh.

(1) *Ram Saran Das Estate* versus *Nathwa and others, Meerut* (Rs. 75)—This suit was instituted on the 13th June 1889 and decided on the 1st December 1892. The claim was for possession of three plots of land. The Munsif held that the defendants had been in undisputed possession for more than 12 years and dismissed the suit as barred by limitation. The Collector thought it was useless to appeal.

(2) *Madhopur Estate* versus *Amir Ahmad, Bareilly* (Rs. 31,999-8-6).—This was a claim for possession of an entire village, a 12 biswa share in another, and other property of considerable value. The facts of the case are briefly as follows:—one Shaikh Núr Ahmad had a son Shams Ahmad, who died during the lifetime of his father, leaving a son Amir Ahmad. The latter in collusion with the karindas of Núr Ahmad obtained possession of the property in dispute, and subsequently obtained an order for mutation of names in his favour. The Court of Wards having taken over the management of Núr Ahmad's estate contended that the defendant had no right to this property. The defendant contested the suit on the ground that the Court of Wards had failed to specify the nature of the collusion and assistance of the karindas by which the defendant had obtained possession. The Sub-Judge dismissed the claim on the ground that there was no evidence to support the allegations made by the Court of Wards. The question of an appeal was referred, with the permission of the Board, to the Standing Counsel, who did not however advise one.

3). *Ramnagar Estate* versus *Kamta Tewari, Bara Banki* (Rs. 1,000).—The claim was for 105 bighas of land situated in Mauza Bamhni. The suit was dismissed, but the Court declared that the defendant was a tenant holding on special terms, possessing a heritable but non-transferable right in the land in dispute. The Deputy Commissioner did not recommend an appeal and in this opinion the Legal Remembrancer concurred.

(4) *Kharka Estate* versus *Kalka Singh, Bara Banki* (Rs. 50).—In this case the estate sued to recover possession of nine biswas of land by the removal of trees said to have been planted in 1291 Fasli by the defendant. The defendant contended that he came into possession of the land 22 years ago; that he planted the trees in question in place of an old grove of trees, which had been cut down; and that he had been in adverse possession for more than 12 years. The Court held that defendant had made out his allegations and the suit was dismissed. The Deputy Commissioner did not advise an appeal and the Legal Remembrancer agreed with him.

(5) *Tanda Estate* versus *Madho and Kirpa, Bara Banki* (Rs. 750).—This was a suit for the cancellation of a deed of sale alleged to have been executed on the 2nd October 1875, by Ahsan Husain Khan (Lunatic—Proprietor of the estate). It was instituted on 25th April 1891, by the manager of the lunatic's estate under section 11, Act XXXV of 1858, and conducted by him without any reference to or instructions from this office. On the 17th September 1892, the case was for the first time reported to this office. From the papers afterwards received it appeared that in a former suit against these same defendants the Sub-Judge and District Judge had both held that it was not satisfactorily proved that Ahsan Husain Khan was insane at the time he executed the sale-deed of 2nd October 1875, and as the Deputy Commissioner did not allege that he was in a position to adduce any additional evidence in the present suit it appeared to my predecessor, the Hon'ble Mr. Deas, that there was little hope of success. The case was submitted for the orders of the Board of Revenue, which decided that as the case had been instituted, as the greater part of the costs had already been incurred, and as the Deputy Commissioner strongly urged its prosecution as a test case, it should proceed. The suit was eventually dismissed by the Sub-Judge on the ground that it was barred by section 13 Civil Procedure Code. As this decision appeared to be erroneous, and with a view to having the case decided on the merits, the Hon'ble Mr. Deas directed an appeal to the Judicial Commissioner, which was filed and admitted after the close of the year.

(6) *Sheodial Singh and another* versus *Raghuraj Singh Estate and others, Allahabad* (Rs. 47-9-8).—This was a suit for recovery of possession of $\frac{3}{8}$ share in land about 6 bighas 2 biswas in area. The plaintiffs alleged that it was situated in their *patti* and that the defendants had no share in it. The defendants contended that the plaintiffs had a $\frac{3}{8}$ share, of which they were in possession, and that the remaining $\frac{5}{8}$ claimed by them belonged to the defendants; that by a mistake the whole of the plot was recorded in the plaintiffs' names, and the claim was barred by Article 144 of Schedule II of the Limitation Act. The Munsif decreed the claim, holding that the defendants had failed to establish possession. An appeal was preferred to the District Judge, who upheld the decision of the Lower Court. The estate was however relieved of costs owing to the other appellants having agreed to pay them in full.

(7) *Jangli Lohar* versus *Pokhra Estate and others, Bara Banki* (Rs. 20).—The claim was for the redemption of a house mortgaged to the other defendants in the suit, and of which the Court of Wards had taken possession on the ground that the plaintiff, to whom the house had belonged, had left the village for good, and that the house accordingly escheated to the estate as zamíndár. The other defendants admitted the justice of the claim, but the Estate disputed it. The claim was decreed by the Munsif on the ground that there was no justification for the action of the Estate. An appeal was not considered advisable either by the Deputy Commissioner or the Legal Remembrancer.

(8) *Suryu Pershad* versus *Pokhra Estate, Bara Banki* (Rs 64) —The suit was to recover possession of a grove The date fixed was for final hearing which fact was not intimated to the Subordinate Government Pleader defending the suit, owing to an oversight in the Court of Wards' office The claim was accordingly decreed, there being no defence on the part of the Court of Wards The Deputy Commissioner did not recommend an appeal

(9) *Munawar Shah* versus *Pokhra Estate, Bara Banki* (Rs 150) —The claim was for a ⅓ share in two plots of land and Rs 80 value of trees cut down The plaintiff failing to establish his right to the land and the claim as regards the cutting down of the trees being admitted by the estate, there was a decree as regards them and the rest of plaintiff's claim was dismissed The plaintiff having got nothing but what the Estate was willing to give him no appeal was necessary

(10) *Bahadur Singh* versus *Mailaraiganj Estate, Bara Banki* (Rs 15) —This was a claim for possession of 1 bigha 2 biswas in one plot of land and 14 biswas *sir* and a grove in another The plaintiff contended that he was in possession of these plots till June 1889, when the estate forcibly and illegally ejected him The suit was summarily dismissed on 25th February 1892, but on appeal it was remanded for trial on the merits The Court held that plaintiff was in possession till June 1889 and as there was no documentary evidence to support the Estate's allegations the claim was decreed An appeal was not deemed advisable by the Deputy Commissioner and the Legal Remembrancer

(11) *Ganesh Singh* versus *Kharka Estate, Bara Banki* (Rs 10).—This was a suit to recover possession of a small strip of land which the plaintiff claimed, alleging that a tenant of the estate had annexed it The *Amin* deputed to measure the land found that the intervening *mandh* had been broken down and that plaintiff's land had been encroached upon The claim was accordingly decreed An appeal was not considered advisable

(12) *Fazal Ahmad* versus *Bhilwal Estate, Bara Banki* (Rs 54 11-0) —This suit was instituted without any reference to or instructions from this office The first the Legal Remembrancer heard of it was when he was asked for instructions regarding the filing of an appeal The Board agreeing with the Legal Remembrancer decided that an appeal should not be filed

(13) *Kashi Pershad* versus *Bhilwal Estate, Bara Banki* (*Rs* 180) —The plaintiff claimed to be mortgagee in possession of about 112 trees and other property under two registered mortgage deeds The Court of Wards contended that the plaintiff was not entitled to the possession of the property, as the mortgagor was not the owner of the property, but a mere tenant-at-will, and that the mortgage-deeds were therefore worthless The Munsif held that in the face of strong and unrebutted documentary evidence it was impossible to ignore the mortgagor's right to the property and decided that the plaintiff was entitled to the possession of all the trees except three The claim was accordingly decreed An appeal was not deemed advisable

(14) *Tilak Ram* versus *Suraipur Estate, Bara Banki* (*Rs* 1,416-4 0) —This suit was brought by plaintiff in respect of a sum of Rs 1,000 borrowed by the Agent of the estate The Court of Wards contended that the debt was not contracted for the benefit of the minor or the estate, and that it was not therefore liable It was proved however that the money had been used for the payment of Government revenue The Sub Judge accordingly decreed plaintiff's claim with costs The Board, agreeing with the Legal Remembrancer, decided not to appeal

(15) *Muhammad Zaki* versus *Telos Estate, Rae Bareli* (*Rs.* 428) —This was a suit under section 9 of Act I of 1877 (Specific Relief Act) for recovery of possession of 21 bighas 18 biswas of land. The claim was decreed for want of satisfactory rebutting evidence on the part of the estate. The case was instituted against the Talukdar before his estate was placed under Court of Wards' management, and the Court of Wards was afterwards added as defendant. The papers were received by the Legal Remembrancer only a few days before the date fixed for hearing and there was no time for enquiry ; as there is no appeal in cases of this kind, the only remedy being a regular suit, the decision of the Munsif could not be questioned.

(16) *Ishwari Hajjam* versus *Bhiragobindpur Estate, Rae Bareli* (*Rs.* 25) —The claim was for possession of a grove valued at Rs. 25. The Board were of opinion that a trivial case like this should have been settled out of Court. This appears not to have been done, and a decree was given *ex parte* against the estate. Under the instructions of the Board no further proceedings were taken.

(17) *Khadim Muhammad* versus *Madarnagar Estate and Ghulam Mujtaba, Unao* (*Rs.* 21,967-8-0).—The claim was for recovery of possession of shares in seven villages. The facts briefly are :—that Musammat Aziz-ul-nissa succeeded to the property in dispute on the death of her husband ; that subsequently she adopted one of her cousins, Altaf Muhammad, and by the terms of the deed of adoption the property was assigned to him without power to sell or mortgage it. Altaf Muhammad predeceased Musammat Aziz-ul-nissa, and on her death mutation of names was effected in favour of Ghulam Mujtaba nephew, and Hafiz Husain, minor under the Court of Wards, grand nephew of her husband, and they were recorded as proprietors with equal shares. Altaf Muhammad's son (Khadim Muhammad) sued for possession of the property in 1890, and a written statement was filed on behalf of the minor under the Court of Wards. As the instructions embodied in Board's Circular No. 7, dated 4th November 1891, had not been issued, no intimation of the institution of the suit was given to the Board or this office. The plaint was returned for amendment and in default of this amendment the case was struck off in October 1890. In March 1891 however the case was again instituted, and later on in 1891, in consequence of the transfer of the Unao District to the Hardoi Judgeship, the case went to the District Judge of Hardoi, who fixed the 28th May 1892 for the settlement of issues. At this stage the case was referred to this office, and it was too late then for the Legal Remembrancer to be able to give much assistance. As Ghulam Mujtaba's interests were identical with those of the minor ward, and as the former had made all preparations to defend his case, the Deputy Commissioner recommended that the defence should be left in his hands. The Board, agreeing with the Legal Remembrancer, approved of the Deputy Commissioner's suggestion, on condition that he satisfied himself that Ghulam Mujtaba was *bonâ fide* doing his best to contest the claim, and that the Government Pleader should watch the interests of the minor ward. There is nothing on the file to show what subsequently happened, but apparently the case went in favour of the plaintiff, as there is a letter from the Hon'ble Mr. Deas to the Deputy Commissioner saying he was of opinion that there were not sufficient grounds for appealing against the decision.

26. Of the eight suits shown as compromised by the Court of Wards, the four shown against the Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad estate related to small pieces of land and were compromised by the Collector without any reference to this office ; the suits shown against the Kharka and Bishunpur estates were settled under the orders of the Board. The particulars of the two remaining cases are as follows:—

(1) *Pitam Singh's daughters* versus *Ghunchai Estate and others, Pilibhit* (*Rs* 96,836-8-7) —The claim was to recover the father's share of the ancestral property with mesne profits, on the ground that he was holding his share in separate possession at the time of his death The defendants challenged the alleged separation as not being recognised by Hindu law, and further pleaded that by a well-established custom females in the family were under all circumstances excluded from inheriting The case was placed in the hands of Mr Conlan, Barrister at-Law, who, on questioning the leading member of the family, elicited from him the fact that a large portion of the family estate had been divided amongst the four branches of the family, and that although the remainder had not been partitioned, its profits had been separately enjoyed by the several groups This statement coupled with the further admission that the plea of custom could not be supported for want of adequate instances left no doubt in Mr Conlan's mind as to what the result of the case must be He accordingly advised the defendants to compromise and the parties agreed to come to terms Mr Conlan succeeded in persuading the plaintiffs to accept a 10 annas share of their father's estate and a sum of Rs 10,000 in full discharge of all claims to profits and costs This result from the defendant's point of view must be regarded as satisfactory, the claim was one of some magnitude, involving, besides other consequences if the defence failed, a liability for mesne profits amounting to over half a lakh of rupees, and there can be no doubt that if the suit had been proceeded with the defendants would have lost it

(2) *Musammat Dalgit Kuar* versus *Akhyapur Estate, Bara Banki* (*Rs* 2,000) — The plaintiff sued for the possession of Mauza Akhyapur as perpetual lessee, basing her claim on an alleged perpetual lease There being no doubt as to the validity of the document, the Board, agreeing with the Legal Remembrancer, directed that the suit should be compromised on the best terms possible and that an offer to surrender the village should, if necessary, be made Plaintiff accepted the terms offered, paying all costs

27 *Statement No I* (*a*) —In this statement appear the miscellaneous applications to which the Court of Wards was a party The majority of these applications are execution of decree cases Out of claims aggregating Rs 55,7 ,9-12-10 in value, Rs 29,789-3-7 was awarded to the estates concerned, and out of Rs. 18,770-3-1½ sought to be recovered against the estates, Rs 9,074-3-2 was awarded to the claimants The figures in this statement are not a true test of the actual results. The applications shown as decided in favour of or against the estates as plaintiffs mean that the applications to take out execution were granted or rejected for the time being Similarly in the cases where the estates appear as defendants, the applications shown as decided in favour of or against them mean that the applications of the opposite parties were rejected or granted for that occasion, and that the parties concerned were at liberty to file fresh applications to recover the amounts still due under the decrees

The execution of decree case shown as "compromised" by the Bhatpura estate was compromised on the judgment-debtor executing a bond, and the one as "withdrawn" by the Gauri Shankar estate was dropped as no further trace of the judgment-debtor's property could be found

28 *Statement No II* —The Court of Wards appeared as appellant in eight and respondent in 43 appeals in the District Courts, in all 51 Of this number 28 were still pending at the close of the year Of the 23 decided cases, 14 were in favour of the Court of Wards and nine against it

29. The two appeals " Raghuraj Singh estate *versus* Sheodial Singh " and "Bahadur Singh *versus* Mailaraiganj estate " have been noticed above in paragraphs 25 (6) and 25 (10) respectively. The remaining seven appeals decided against Estates were as follows :—

(1) *Mathura Kasera, plaintiff-appellant,* versus *Babu Sikhir Chand Estate, defendant-respondent, Gorakhpur* (Rs. 200).—The plaintiff asserted that he owned and held a certain house left by his maternal grandfather, Gurbakhsh, which was wrongfully mortgaged to the defendant for an unlawful consideration, and that in virtue of this mortgage the Court of Wards had got the house notified for sale. The plaintiff lost his case in the Lower Court. He appealed, and the only question in appeal was whether or not he was the grandson of Gurbakhsh. The Sub-Judge held that this was proved and decreed the appeal. A second appeal was not considered advisable.

(2), (3) *and* (4) *Mir Kalab Husain, plaintiff-appellant,* versus *Naraulı Estate, defendant-respondent, Bara Banki* (Rs. 7,541-8-0).—The claims in these three cases were similar, being for money due on promissory notes. The whole question was whether they had been executed for the benefit of the estate. The Court, holding that the money was borrowed for the benefit of the estate, and that the estate was liable, decreed the claims Second appeals in all three cases have been filed in the Judicial Commissioner's Court and were pending at the close of the year.

(5) *Ganesh Singh, plaintiff-appellant,* versus *Mailaraiganj Estate, defendant-respondent, Bara Banki* (Rs. 30).—The suit was for possession of 4 bighas 12 biswas of land from which the plaintiff had been ejected by the estate. The Munsif dismissed the claim. Plaintiff appealed to the District Judge, who found that he had established his case and allowed the appeal; a second appeal was not considered advisable.

(6) *Hardyal, defendant-appellant,* versus *Surajpur Estate, plaintiff-respondent, Bara Banki* (Rs 3,590).—This was a claim for Rs. 4,225 brought by the Deputy Commissioner, as guardian of the minor, against Hardyal. The defence was that the Deputy Commissioner could not sue. The plea was based upon section 175 of Act XVII of 1876, and the Hon'ble Mr. Knox thought that there would be some difficulty in meeting this contention. The suit however was decided in favour of the estate Against this decree Hardyal appealed and the Sub-Judge held that under her husband's will the Ráni and not the Deputy Commissioner was the guardian of the minor, and that she was appointed guardian within the meaning of section 175 of Act XVII of 1876 and that the suit should therefore have been brought by her and in her name. It appears that the Deputy Commissioner in complying with the orders of Government removed the Ráni from the guardianship of the minor in respect of his *property* only, and not in respect of his *person*. Whether he interpreted his instructions correctly or not is not known in this office, but apparently he did not. The opinion of the Standing Counsel was taken on the subject of filing a second appeal, and he advised, that though the suit should have been brought in the name of the Ráni, at the same time the defect was only a formal one, and the claim should not have been dismissed in appeal upon such a ground. A second appeal has accordingly been filed in the Judicial Commissioner's Court.

(7) *Baiju Sah, plaintiff-appellant,* versus *Ramnagar Estate, defendant-respondent, Bara Banki* (Rs. 4,000).—The claim was for Rs. 4,000 damages in respect of a market which had been leased to the plaintiff and of the possession of

which he had been deprived. The Lower Court dismissed the suit on a technical point. In appeal this order was reversed and the case was remanded for trial on the merits. It was still pending when the year closed.

30. *Statement No. III.*—(*Privy Council, High Court, &c.*).—The Court of Wards, North-Western Provinces and Oudh, was a party as appellant and respondent to 38 appeals. Of this number 20 were still pending at the close of the year Of those decided 14 were in favour of and four against the estates concerned

The appeals lost were :—

(1) *Gauri Shankar Prasad Estate, plaintiff-appellant,* versus *Sheogobind Singh, defendant-respondent, Gházipur* (Rs. 4,000).—The suit was to recover possession of bighas 1,804 odd. The allegation was (1) that this land formed part of 9,994 bighas, which Government had settled with the estate in 1865, and (2) that in 1876, owing to sharp practice on the part of a kanúngo, the land was taken from it and settled with the defendant. The defendant repned that the land had been settled with him in 1860; that in 1865 the river passed through the land and formed it into an island and hence it passed out of defendant's possession; that subsequently the river changed its course and the land reverted to its former position and was therefore settled with the defendant. The Sub-Judge decreed the claim. Defendant appealed and the Judge reversed the decision of the Lower Court, holding that plaintiff was merely a "lessee of Government rights of disposal of this island or *chur*" and that plaintiff was only entitled to it so long as it remained an island; that it had ceased to be an island, and plaintiff had therefore no longer any right to it. An appeal was preferred to the High Court, but it was dismissed.

(2) *Gauri Shankar Prasad Estate, defendant-appellant,* versus *Máhárani Surna Mayi, plaintiff-respondent, Gházipur* (Rs. 1,200).—This appeal was noticed at page 10, paragraph 25 of the Report for the year ending 30th September 1890. The appeal on behalf of the estate was dismissed by the High Court.

(3) *Musammat Badamo, deceased, represented by Kaisri Mal, plaintiff-appellant,* versus *Anandi Estate and Dhanpat Rai, defendants-respondents, Bijnor* (Rs. 1,097-14-3).—The claim was for proprietary possession of certain shares in different mauzas. The facts of the case briefly are :—after the death of Gauri Lal (husband of Musammat Badamo), Dhanpat Rai, Musammat Badamo's manager, had mutation of names effected in respect of one-half of the shares in favour of the Musammat, and in respect of the other half, in favour of his own son Shankar Lal. On the death of the latter Dhanpat Rai wanted to get the name of Musammat Anandi (deceased's widow) entered. Musammat Badamo heard of this and filed a petition in the Revenue Court praying that mutation of names be made in her favour. The petition was rejected and the Musammat was referred to the Civil Court, mutation of names being, meanwhile, made in favour of Musammat Anandi, the minor ward. Musammat Badamo died while the suit was in progress and Kaisri Mal was then made a party to the suit as her representative The Court of Wards contended that Gauri Lal had adopted Shankar Lal, husband of Musammat Anandi, and that after the death of these two men the property passed to Musammat Anandi. The Sub-Judge of Moradabad held that Musammat Anandi was the owner of the property in dispute. Against this finding Kaisri Mal appealed to the High Court, which decreed the appeal holding that the adoption had not been proved.

(4). *Musammat Wajiha Bibi and another, plaintiffs-appellants*, versus *Saras Mir Estate, and others, defendants-respondents, Azamgarh* (Rs. 5,798).—Appellants alleged that there was an old *bandh* on their estate, and that the Court of Wards erroneously considering it to be a new one had cut it and caused them damage. The estate contended that the *bandh* was a new one, and that as it was causing injury to them the cutting was justifiable. The Lower Court dismissed plaintiffs' claim that the *bandh* was never to be cut, but upheld their claim as to its being maintained in its former state, subject to its being cut on necessity arising and closed up again. In the High Court the appeal, in so far as it related to a declaration of the plaintiffs' right to the embankment and to have the same repaired at the defendants' cost, was decreed against the Collector and dismissed against the other respondents Plaintiffs' claim for damages was rejected. Between the Collector and the appellants costs were allowed proportionately, and the costs of the other respondents were allowed against appellants.

31. The results of the year for the Court of Wards' litigation in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh are given in the subjoined table :—

Department litigating	Court of Wards Plaintiff or Appellant	Court of Wards Defendant Respondent.	Total.	For the Estate	Against the Estate	Pending.	Percentage in favour of the Estate.
I Court of Wards, N.-W. Provinces							
Courts of first instance	34	30	64	30	4	*23	88
District Court appeals	3	8	11	2	2	7	50
High Court do. ...	3	16	19	7	4	8	63
Total ...	40	54	94	39	10	38	79
II. Court of Wards, Oudh.							
Courts of first instance	131	70	201	98	33	†62	74
District Court appeals	5	35	40	12	7	21	63
High Court do	11	8	19	7	0	12	100
Total	147	113	260	117	40	95	74
GRAND TOTAL .	187	167	354	156	50	133	76

* 6 were compromised and 1 withdrawn
† 3 „ „ and 5 „

32. *Statement No IV.*—The realizations of sums outstanding from previous years and amounts decreed during the year have been as follows :—

	Total demand	Realized	Percentage realized.	
	Rs. a p	Rs. a p.	1892-93.	1891-92.
Claims ...	85,440 10 7	20,387 15 4	23	25
Interest	19,396 10 6	6,848 2 5	35	38
Costs	40,466 13 6	9,033 13 4	22	26

The sums shown as outstanding are as follows :—

	Rs. a p
Claims	63,753 8 0
Interest	... 11,504 6 9
Costs	... 29,064 15 11

Of these balances Rs. 2,528-14-1 is reported irrecoverable and Rs. 26,269-2-2 doubtful.

33 The Estates which show the heaviest balances are the following —

North Western Provinces

		Rs	a	p
1	Ghazipur Gauri Shankar	21 502	2	9
2	Bareilly Mashuk Mahal Begam	10 170	4	11
3	Gorakhpur Sikhar Chand	6 088	14	10
4	Allahabad Bara	4 915	13	7
5	Gorakhpur Bansgaon	4 680	15	7
6	Mainpuri Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad	3 211	12	0
7	Gorakhpur Majhauli	3 122	1	8
8	Allahabad Bindeshri Parshad	2 597	1	6
9	Moradabad Mohib Ali Khan	1 933	15	0
10	Etawah Roshangpur	1 735	5	7

Oudh

11	Bara Banki Surajpur	16 635	5	6
12	Kheri Khairigarh	7 881	3	2
13	Bara Banki Ramnagar	2 823	8	6
14	Rae Bareli Piloi	2 301	11	0
15	Sultánpur Rámpur	1 28_	14	1
16	Bara Banki Mallaraganj	1 203	5	7
17	Bahraich Rehwa	1 080	1	1

(1) *Gauri Shankar Estate (Gházipur)* —These balances were noticed in last year's Report as no property belonging to Sarju Parshad could be traced, the amount due from him has been returned as doubtful

(2) *Mashuk Mahal Begam Estate (Bareilly)* —The decrees for the recovery of these balances are under execution,

(3) *Sikhar Chand Estate (Gorakhpur)* —Rs 3,421-15-8 is under execution for the recovery of Rs 1,268-0 10 orders for attachment of the judgment-debtor's property have been issued, for Rs 2,272-10-2 judgment-debtor's property has been sold, but the sale was not confirmed when the year closed The balance Rs 36-4-2 was struck off on appeal

(4) *Bara Estate (Allahabad)* —Of this balance Rs 26-2-6 is irrecoverable and Rs 3,686 13-7 doubtful For the rest Rs 1,202-13-6 execution proceedings are in progress

(5) *Bansgaon Estate (Gorakhpur)* —This balance represents the costs decreed by the Privy Council in the case "Babu Palakdhari Singh *versus* the Bansgaon estate" An application for the recovery of this amount has been filed in the High Court and notice has been issued to the opposite party

(6) *Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad Estate (Mainpuri)* —For the recovery of this balance decrees are under execution

(7) *Majhauli Estate (Gorakhpur)*.—This balance is due from one Lachman Rai As this case relates to the portion of the estate taken over by the Bengal Court of Wards it has been handed over to the Collector of Saran This balance therefore will not appear in future reports

(8) *Bindeshri Parshad Estate (Allahabad)* —The Collector reports that this estate has only recently come under the Court of Wards, and that these figures have been abstracted from statements filed by the former *karinda* and cannot therefore be relied upon as accurate Steps are being taken to obtain the correct figures before starting execution proceedings

(9) *Mohib Ali Khan Estate (Moradabad)* —Rs 1,603-9-0 due from Musammat Abbasi Begam is being realized from her allowance The balance Rs 330-6 0 was the costs awarded to the estate in the High Court appeal, Sahu Ajudhia *versus* the estate The copy of the decree had not reached the Collector when the year closed

(10) *Roshangpur Estate* (*Etáwah*).—The greater portion of the balance, *viz.* Rs. 1,656-11-11, together with Rs 64-14-3 interest up to June 1893, was noticed in last year's Report, and Rs. 13-11-5 was under execution when this Estate was released on the 1st July last.

(11) *Surajpur Estate* (*Bara Banki*).—Rs. 4,442-8-0 is pending in appeal. For Rs. 41-9-0 a bond has been executed by the judgment-debtor. For Rs. 977-3-6 execution was to be applied for and in most of the remaining cases execution proceedings are in progress.

(12) *Khairigarh Estate* (*Kheri*).—Rs. 99-6-0 has been deposited in Court pending appeal. Rs. 1,308-9-4 is also pending in appeal; for the balance decrees have been executed and property attached.

(13) *Rámnagar Estate* (*Bara Banki*).—Of this balance Rs. 1,421-4-0 is irrecoverable. For the recovery of Rs. 493-12-0 property is being traced. Security has been filed for Rs. 523-6-6. Rs. 320-10-0 has been disallowed in appeal; and for the balance execution proceedings are pending.

(14) *Tiloi Estate* (*Rae Bareli*).—The whole of this balance, except Rs. 162-3-0, the decree for which is under execution, represents sums decreed to the Estate during the year under review. The necessary steps for its recovery were being taken when the year closed.

(15) *Rámpur Estate* (*Sultánpur*).—For Rs. 1,251-5-1 the sale statement of judgment-debtor's immovable property was under prepration. The balance was under execution in Benares. Report of the result had not reached the Deputy Commissioner when the year closed.

(16) *Mailaraiganj Estate* (*Bara Banki*).—For the recovery of this balance execution proceedings are in progress.

(17) *Rehwa Estate* (*Bahraich*).—Rs. 160 have been realized out of the Rs. 925-3-9 noticed in last year's Report; for the balance execution proceedings are in progress.

34 *Statement No. V.*—The receipts aggregated Rs. 36,415-1-3 against Rs. 45,629-9-10 in the previous year. In the prosecution and defence of cases Rs. 26,719-9-11 was expended as against Rs. 23,705-1-4 in the previous year. The total disbursements, including the amount with costs awarded against estates, were Rs. 43,344-13-1.

The highest expenditure appears in the following districts :—

		Rs.	a	p.
1.	Bara Banki, Rámnagar	8,685	11	5
2	Fyzabad, Musepur	4,894	7	0
3	Bareilly, Madhopur	4,457	10	3
4.	Bara Banki, Naraulí	3,727	1	0
5	„ Surajpur	3,042	6	9
6.	Partábgarh, Bargaon	2,017	9	3
7	Gorakhpur, Majhauli	1,783	13	9
8.	Moradabad, Mohib Ali Khan	1,417	8	6
9.	Cawnpore, Janki Parshad	1,343	13	9
10	Rae Bareli, Tiloi	1,117	4	6
11.	Kheri, Khairigarh	1,032	14	9

(1) *Rámnagar Estate* (*Bara Banki*).—Rs. 7,085-15-11 represents the amount paid in satisfaction of two decrees and the balance was spent in defending and conducting 21 cases and six appeals.

(2) *Musepur Estate* (*Fyzobad*).—Rs 3,980 represents the sums paid in the suits brought against the Estate by Sheo Narain Kuar and Sheobalak Kuar, and of the balance, Rs. 273 was expended in the suit "Estate *versus*

Gulabdei" won by the estate.

(3) *Madhopur Estate* (*Bareilly*).—Of this charge Rs. 940-15-0 was the amount, including costs, awarded against the Estate and Rs. 2,231-8-0 was the sum spent in defending the Amir Ahmad case [*vide* paragraph 25(2)] Rs. 1,153-9-9 was spent in defending the suit of Musammat Rabbani Begam against the Estate for Rs. 1,06,800 and the balance in conducting one case on behalf of the Estate.

(4) *Naraull Estate* (*Bara Banki*).—Rs. 236-13-0 represents the costs paid to one Mir Kalb Husain; of the balance Rs. 1,635-2-0 was expended in the Privy Council appeal "Ahmedi Begam *versus* the estate," and the remainder in defending three appeals (now pending in the Judicial Commissioner's Court) filed by Mir Kalb Husain.

(5) *Surajpur Estate* (*Bara Banki*).—Rs. 282-4-0 was paid to one Tilak Ram, decree-holder, and the balance was spent in conducting and defending 33 cases and 11 appeals (one of which before the Judicial Commissioner is valued at Rs. 14,336-7-11).

(6) *Bargaon Estate* (*Partábgarh*).—Rs. 2,000 was expended in defending the suit valued at Rs. 2,00,000, brought by Lalchattarpal Singh against the Estate. This suit was pending when the year closed.

(7) *Majhauli Estate* (*Gorakhpur*).—This charge represents the sums paid to two decree-holders, who had obtained decrees against the estate.

(8) *Mohib Ali Khan Estate* (*Moradabad*).—This charge represents the costs incurred in defending the suit brought by Musammat Abbasi Begam against the estate for dower, valued at Rs. 1,25,000.

(9) *Janki Parshad Estate* (*Cawnpore*).—The greater portion of this charge, *viz*, Rs. 1,289-5-0, was paid to one Madho Pershad. The balance represents the costs incurred in conducting and defending two suits and two appeals, one of the latter being in the High Court.

(10) *Tiloi Estate* (*Rai Bareli*).—Rs. 47-2-0 was paid to Muhammad Zaki, whose case is noticed in paragraph 25(15), and Rs. 8-8-0 to one Lal Madhu. Rs. 1,011-4-6 was expended in prosecuting two suits, five applications for execution of decrees, three regular appeals and three appeals in the Judicial Commissioner's Court.

(11) *Khairigarh Estate* (*Kheri*).—Rs. 79-5-0 was paid to one Maharáj Singh, decree-holder. Rs. 425 was expended in conducting the appeal "Estate *versus* Wajid Husain" which was pending at the close of the year, and the balance in prosecuting and defending one suit, 16 applications for execution of decrees and three appeals.

APPENDIX D.

35. This appendix calls for no remarks. It is a statement classifying the whole of the litigation relating to the State, Municipal Boards, and Court of Wards, according to the nature of the suits and the proceedings. The results appearing in this statement have been noticed in paragraph 5 of this Report.

APPENDIX E.

36. Out of a total sum of Rs. 57,589-1-2, Rs. 6,569-7-9, or about 11 per cent, has been recovered as against 8 per cent. in the previous year and Rs. 11,957-15-2 (20 per cent. against 26 per cent. in the last year) has been expunged as irrecoverable.

The year closed with a balance of Rs. 39,061-10-3.

37. The balances exceeding Rs 1,000 are as follows —

	Rs	a	p
(1) Allahabad	5 402	10	0
(2) Jaunpur	5,084	15	3
(3) Bahraich	4,046	10	0
(4) Moradabad	3,798	3	7
(5) Ghazipur	3,197	10	8
(6) Muttra	3,070	8	0
(7) Benares	1,928	15	0
(8) Cawnpore	1,926	8	0
(9) Mainpuri	1 852	7	9
(10) Agra	1,393	4	0
(11) Farukhabad	1,208	12	0
(12) Gonda	1,041	3	6

The dues for the year under report were large in Jaunpur, Ghazipur, Bahraich, Muttra and Rae-Bareli.

Agra Allahabad, and Jaunpur show the largest realizations

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

R H. MACLEOD,

Legal Remembrancer to Government,
North-Western Provinces and Oudh.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT I.—*Return of civil suits and miscellaneous proceedings to which the State was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by Courts of First Instance between October the 1st, 1892, and September the 30th, 1893.*

Division.	District.	State, Plaintiff.										State, Defendant.									
				Decided.									Decided.								
		No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.		No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.	
			Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.			Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.	
MEERUT ...	Dehra Dún	(f) 3	4,542 8 0	(f)1	(f)2	...	...	39 9 0	...	...		1	140 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	140 0 0	
	Saháranpur	1	200 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	200 0 0		1	5,500 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Meerut	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		4	495 10 0	...	...	†2	...	...	2	325 10 0	
	Muttra	1	1,775 11 9	1	...	...	...	1,775 11 9	...	...		5	1,164 15 6	1	...	...	*3	...	1	100 0 0	
AGRA ...	Agra	1	25 0 0	1	...	...	...	25 0 0	...	...		3	1,172 0 0	2	1	...	...	500 0 0	...	...	
	Etah	1	113 6 0	1	...	...	...	113 6 0	...	...		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Mainpuri	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		1	3,326 0 0	...	1	...	...	3,326 0 0	...	...	
	Bijnor	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		2	(a)13,038 2 9	...	1	...	...	6,040 14 9	1	5,500 0 0	
ROHILKHAND ...	Moradabad	(c)1	373 13 0	...	...	...	...	...	(c)1	373 13 0		3	2,630 9 6	1	...	§1	‖1	...	...	...?	
	Badaun	(c)1	24 2 0	(c)1	...	...	...	24 2 0	...	...		1	484 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Bareilly	(f)11	No value given.	(f)7	(f)2	...	...	No value given.	2	No value given.		1	186 3 6	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Sháhjahánpur... ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		1	1,00,000 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
ALLAHABAD ...	Allahabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		3	8,999 6 3	1	...	...	†2	...	...	...	
BENARES ...	Jaunpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		4	137 2 0	1	...	...	†3	...	...	...	
	Benares	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		(b)18	40,002 4 10	4	3	...	**1	812 14 9	10	29,675 15 4	
	Ballia	(c)1	107 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	(c)1	107 0 0		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
GORAKHPUR ...	Azamgarh	1	81 7 11½	1	...	...	...	81 7 11½	...	...		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Gorakhpur	(f)10	31,611 13 9	(f)2	(f)1	...	...	(g)15,743 7 8	7	5,878 6 1		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Basti	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		(d)2	2,433 5 4½	...	(b)1	...	...	No value ...	1	No value given	
KUMAUN ...	Garhwál	1	179 0 0	1	...	...	...	179 0 0	...	...		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...	33	39,033 14 5½	16	5	..	...	17,981 12 4½	12	6,559 3 1		50	1,79,709 11 8½	14	7	3	10	10,679 13 6	16	35,641 9 4	
	OUDH.																				
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow	3	38 2 0	(e)2	...	...	...	27 13 0	1	10 5 0		5	2,029 14 6	3	1	...	...	9 0 0	1	181 5 6	
	Unao	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		1	18 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Sitapur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		1	No value given	...	1	...	...	No value given,	...	...	
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad	2	148 3 3	2	...	...	...	148 3 3	...	...		2	61 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	1	50 0 0	
	Bahraich	1	151 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	151 4 0		1	3,55,000 0 0	...	1	...	...	1,00,007 1 11	...	...	
	Bara Banki	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		2	575 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Partábgarh	(e)2	94 5 11	(e)1	...	...	...	16 9 0	(e)1	77 12 11		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Total, Oudh ...	8	431 15 2	5	...	...	...	192 9 3	3	239 5 11		12	3,57,683 14 6	7	3	...	...	1,00,016 1 11	2	231 5 6	
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh ..	41	39,465 13 7½	21	5	...	...	18,174 5 7½	15	6,798 9 0		62	5,37,393 10 2½	21	10	3	10	1,10,695 15 5	18	35,872 14 10	

* Value Rs 1,016-15-6. | ‡ Value Rs. 8,499-6-3. | ‖ Value Rs. 2,000-0-0. | **No actual value.
† Value Rs. 105-2-0. | § Value Rs. 30-9-6. | ¶ Value Rs. 170-0-0.

(a) The value of the case pending last year was incorrectly shown by Collector as Rs. 5,888-13-9, it should have been Rs. 7,538-2-9.
(b) The state was merely a formal defendant.
(c) These are execution of decree cases.
(d) One of these suits had "no value" assigned to it.
(e) Of these one for Rs. 27-13-0, was an execution of decree case, and the other had "No value" assigned to it.
(f) References under Act X of 1870.
(g) Amount awarded is compensation by the court in references under Act X of 1870.
(h) Of these five were references under Act X of 1870, one was decided in favor of the State and four are pending.

NOTE.—The case shown pending against Kheri last year was an execution of decree, the amount being recovered, the case has been omitted, *vide* paragraph 14, page 6 of last year's Report..

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT II.—*Return of civil suits to which the State was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by District Courts of Appeal between October the 1st, 1892, and September the 30th, 1893.*

Division.	District.	State, Appellant.								State, Respondent.							
		No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.
			Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
MEERUT	Debra Dun	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	23 5 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Meerut	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,461 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,461 4 0
AGRA	Agra	2	549 0 0	1	1	...	...	500 0 0	...	...	1	400 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
ROHILKHAND	Badaun	...	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	1	150 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
ALLAHABAD	Cawnpore	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	940 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Allahabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...	1	500 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, N.-W. Provinces	2	549 0 0	1	1	...	...	500 0 0	...	...	7	4,474 9 0	6	...	...	...	...	1	2,461 4 0
	OUDH.																		
LUCKNOW	Lucknow	1	67 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Sitapur	1	No value given	...	.	..	...	...	1	No value given	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
FYZABAD	Fyzabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	233 8 0	3	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bahraich	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	49 7 0	...	1	...	...	49 7 0	...	...
	Bara Banki	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	560 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, Oudh	2	67 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	1	No value given.	5	842 15 0	4	1	...	..	49 7 0	...	...
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh.	4	616 0 0	1	2	...	..	500 0.0	1	No value given.	12	5,317 8 0	10	1	...	...	49 7 0	1	2,461 4 0

Reference under Act X of 1840.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT III.—*Suits to which the State was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by the Privy Council, High Court, N.-W. Provinces, and Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, between October the 1st, 1892, and September the 30th, 1893.*

Division.	District.	State, Appelant.									State, Respondent.								Remarks.
		No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of appeals pending	Value of claims pending.	No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	
			Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.	
MEERUT ...	Sahâranpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	No value given.	...	...	...	...	...	2	No value given.	References under Act X of 1870.
ROHILKHAND ...	Bijnor	1	6,040 14 9	...	...	...	...	...	1	6,040 14 9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Moradabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	6,000 0 0	...	1	...	...	6,000 0 0	...	...	
	Shâhjahânpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,00,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,00,000 0 0	
ALLAHABAD ...	Allahabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,93,853 6 7	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,93,853 6 7	
BENARES ...	Benares	1	5,094 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
GORAKHPUR ...	Gorakhpur	1	5,100 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	5,100 0 0	...	...								
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...	3	16,234 14 9	...	1	...	...	...	2	11,140 14 9	5	2,99,853 6 7	...	1	...	...	6,000 0 0	4	2,93,853 6 7	
	OUDH.																			
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow	1	9 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	9 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Total, Oudh ...	1	9 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	9 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Total, N.-W. Provinces and Oudh.	4	16,243 14 9	...	1	...	...	...	3	11,149 14 9	5	2,99,853 6 7	...	1	...	...	6,000 0 0	4	2,93,853 6 7	

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT IV (No. I).—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the State was realized or remitted during the year* 1892-93, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October* 1893.

Division.	District.	Sums outstanding on the 1st October 1892			Awarded to State between 1st October 1892 and 30th September 1893.			Total.			Realized during 1892 93.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal	Interest.	Costs	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.
		Rs a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p:	Rs. a. p.	Rs a. p.	Rs a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs a. p.	Rs. a p.	Rs a. p.	Rs. a. p
MEERUT ..	Saháranpur .	8,297 15 1	..	194 9 0	...	..	4 0 0	8 297 15 1	...	194 9 0	...	...	...
	Meerut	...	...	205 6 0	.	11 8 9	202 15 0	...	11 8 9	209 6 0	...	11 8 9	208 5 0
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	..	...	4 5 6	...	...	214 15 0	821 8 6	...	207 4 6	...	...	142 14 6
	Agra	796 8 0	...	86 3 0	25 0 0	...	24 15 0	2,466 0 9	234 12 3	301 2 0	25 0 0	...	200 7 0
	Etah	2,352 10 9	234 13 3	310 12 6	114 6 0	...	64 11 0	225 0 0	16 9 3	335 11 6	471 8 0	..	20 8 0
	Mainpuri .	.	3 13 0	863 11 6	225 0 0	12 12 3			...	928 6 0	...	12 12 3	.
ROHILKHAND,	Bijnor . ..	...	..	2 4 6	...	...	48 5 0	...	...	2 4 6	...	.	37 8 0
	Moradabad ..	..	..	401 5 6	...	...	34 5 0	.	.	449 10 0	.	.	32 4 0
	Badaun ..	...	.	24 2. 0	...	...	36 1 6	156 14 [illegible]	28 13 0	58 7 0	...	..	31 4 6
	Bareilly	158 14 5	19 6 6		...	9 6 6	508 10 0			36 1 6	...		61 5 4
	Sháhjahánpur ..	...	..	61 5 4	...	...	92 3 0	50 0 0	..	569 15 4	...		169 9 0
	Cawnpore ..	...	...	100 7 0	50 0 0	...		...	...	192 10 0	.	.	...
ALLAHABAD ..	Fatehpur ..	..	...	*20 14 3	..	..	62 15 0	235 15 0	66 8 3	20 14 3	...		...
	Allahabad ..	235 15 0	57 13 0	2,283 11 9	. .	8 11 3	7 15 0	...	..	2 245 10 9	123 7 6	8 11 3	6 1 0
	Jaunpur ...	...	...	104 9 6	...	..	154 1 0	..	...	112 8 6		...	78 12 0
BENARES .	Benares	...	...	294 8 0	...	...		...		448 9 0		...	..
	Ballia	...	..	118 11 6	...	.	115 10 6	...	...	118 11 6	...	...	14 11 0
GORAKHPUR ...	Gorakhpur ...	...	...	3 4 6	...	..		...	...	118 15 0		...	...
	Azamgarh ...	...	...	33 12 1	.	..	10 2 0	...	...	33 12 1	...	...	10 2 0
KUMAUN .	Garhwál	..	...	...	...	...		...	...	10 2 0	...	...	
	Total, N.-W Provinces	11.829 15 3	315 12 9	5 012 14 5	413 6 0	42 6 9	1,561 12 0	12,253 5 [illegible]	358 3 6	6.594 10 5	619 15 6	83 0 3	1,003 11 4
	OUDH												
	Lucknow ...	..	...	...	...	..	127 2 0	..	...	127 2 0		...	118 10 0
LUCKNOW ...	Unao	...	...	...	...	...	18 12 0	...	...	18 12 0	...	...	.
	Kheri ..	300 0 0	.	785 1 0	...	...	75 12 0	300 0 0	..	560 13 0	300 0 0	...	860 13 0
	Fyzabad	..	...	*78 4 3	49 3 3	..	29 4 0	49 3 3	..	107 8 3	45 8 0	...	12 2 0
FYZABAD ...	Bahraich ...	..	...	49 7 0	...	...	...	.	...	49 7 0	...	...	...
	Bara Banki ..	†205 0 0	...	.	..	..	...	205 0 0	...	.	.	.	...
	Partabgarh .	*4 5 11	...	19 3 3	...	.	3 11 9	94 5 11	...	22 15 0	16 9 0	...	10 13 9
	Total, Oudh .	509 5 11		931 15 6	49 3 3	...	254 9 9	648 9 2	...	1,186 9 3	362 1 0	...	1,002 6 9
	Total, N.-W P and Oudh.	12,139 5 2	315 12 9	5,944 13 11	462 9 3	42 6 9	1,836 5 9	12,901 14 5	358 3 6	7,781 3 8	982 0 6	33 0 3	2,006 2 1

* Last year's balance was reported as incorrect by Collector.
† Last year's balance was reduced to Rs. 205 in appeal.

STATEMENT IV. (No. II)—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the State was realized or remitted during the year* 1892-93, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October* 1893—(concluded).

Division.	District.	Balance.			Remitted.			Net Total			Analysis of balance.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal	Interest	Costs	Recoverable.	Irrecoverable.	Doubtful.
		Rs. a. p	Rs a. p	Rs. a. p	Rs a. p	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p	Rs. a p	Rs a. p.	Rs a. p	Rs a p.	Rs a a	Rs. a. p
MEERUT ...	Sahāranpur ...	8,297 15 1		194 9 0	8,297 15 1	...	...	...	...	194 9 0	194 9 0	...	...
	Meerut ...	...	...	1 1 0	...	...	1 0 0	...	...	0 1 0	0 1 0		...
	Muttra ...	...	...	64 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	64 6 0	...		...
AGRA	Agra ...	796 8 0		100 11 0	...	...	10 11 0	796 8 0		90 0 0		886 8 0	
	Etah ...	1,994 8 9	234 12 3	315 3 6	...	...	...	1,994 8 9	234 12 3	315 3 6	2,344 8 6	...	
	Mainpuri ...	225 0 0	3 13 0	928 6 0	...	...	863 11 0	225 0 0	3 13 0	64 11 0	293 8 0		...
ROHILKHAND,	Bijnor ...	...	...	2 4 6	...	...	2 4 6	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Moradabad ...	...	...	422 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	422 2 0	422 2 0	...	...
	Badaun ...	...	26 3 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	26 3 0	26 3 0	...	...
	Bareilly ...	156 14 5	28 13 0	4 13 0	...	...	...	156 14 5	28 13 0	4 13 0	190 8 5	...	...
	Shāhjahānpur ...	...	...	508 10 0	...	...	...	...	...	508 10 0	508 10 0	...	...
	Cawnpore ...	50 0 0	...	23 1 0	50 0 0	...	12 1 0	...		11 0 0	*11 0 0		...
ALLAHABAD ...	Fatehpur ...	...		20 14 3	...	...	20 14 3	...		...	...		...
	Allahabad ...	112 7 6	57 13 0	2 245 10 9	72 0 0	57 13 0	180 3 9	*40 7 6	...	2,065 7 0	2,042 7 6	63 7 0	...
	Jaunpur ...	...	...	106 7 6	...	...	...	...	...	106 7 6	1 14 0	104 9 6	
BENARES ...	Benares ...	...	...	369 13 0	...	...	...	...	...	369 13 0	75 5 0	294 8 0	...
	Ballia ...	...	...	118 11 6	...	...	11 11 6	...	...	107 0 0	...		
GORAKHPUR...	Gorakhpur ...	...	...	104 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	104 4 0	104 4 0	...	...
	Azamgarh ...	...	...	33 12 1	...	...	...	...	...	33 12 1	†33 12 1	...	...
	Total N.-W Provinces ...	11,633 5 9	325 3 3	5,590 15 1	8,419 15 1	57 13 0	1,102 9 0	3,213 6 8	267 6 3	4,488 6 1	6,620 2 6	1,349 0 6	...
	OUDH.												
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow ...	...		8 8 0	...	...	8 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Unāo ...	...	...	18 12 0	...	...	...	...	...	18 12 0	18 12 0	...	...
	Fyzabad ...	3 11 3	...	95 6 3	...	...	...	3 11 3	...	95 6 3	99 1 6	...	...
	Bahraich ...	...	...	49 7 0	...	...	...	...	...	49 7 0	49 7 0	...	...
FYZABAD ...	Bāra Banki ...	205 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	205 0 0	...	...	205 0 0	...	...
	Partabgarh ...	77 12 11	...	12 1 3	...	...	...	77 12 11	...	12 1 3	89 14 2	...	...
	Total Oudh ...	286 8 2	...	184 2 6	...	...	8 8 0	286 8 2	...	175 10 6	462 2 8	...	...
	Total. N.-W P and Oudh ...	11,919 13 11	325 3 3	5,775 1 7	8,419 15 1	57 13 0	1,111 1 0	3,499 14 10	267 6 3	4,664 0 7	7,082 3 2	1,349 0 6	

* Realized after the close of the year under report

† This balance has been deposited in court and will be recovered shortly.

APPENDIX A

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by the State under decrees of the Court between 1st October 1892 and 30th September 1893*

Division	District	Receipts	Nature of disbursements			
			Amount including costs awarded against the State in regular suits	In prosecution	In defence	Total
		Rs as p	Rs as p	Rs as p	Rs as p	Rs as p
MEERUT	Dehra Dun		488 12 8	77 0 0		565 12 8
	Saharanpur		29 7 0	58 4 0	125 0 0	212 11 0
	Meerut	219 13 9	100 0 0		43 0 0	143 0 0
AGRA	Muttra	142 14 6			62 1 3	62 1 3
	Agra	25 7 0	4 1 6	120 0 0	38 9 0	163 9 6
	Etah	492 0 0		12 12 0	12 3 0	24 15 0
	Mainpuri	12 12 3		19 3 0	41 8 0	60 11 0
ROHILKHAND	Bijnor				55 3 6	55 3 6
	Moradabad	27 8 0	30 0 0	4 12 0	92 14 3	127 12 3
	Budaun	32 4 0		2 4 0	52 0 0	54 4 0
	Bareilly	31 4 6	6 0 0	32 8 0	10 13 0	49 5 0
	Shahjahanpur	61 5 4		87 4 6	685 2 0	772 6 6
ALLAHABAD	Cawnpore	169 9 0	220 0 6		31 6 0	260 15 6
	Banda		71 7 6			71 7
	Allahabad	132 2 9			155 10 0	155 10
BENARES	Jaunpur	6 1 0	95 2 0		6 3 0	101 5
	Benares	78 12 0	568 10 1	11 4 0	74 15 0	654 13 1
	Ballia			12 0 0	0 13 3	12 13 3
GORAKHPUR	Gorakhpur	14 11 0	29 3 0	237 3 6		266 6 6
	Azamgarh			5 6 9	..	5 6 9
KUMAON	Garhwal	10 2 0		10 2 0		10 2 0
	Total N W Provinces	1 656 11 1	1 652 7 3	690 8 9	1 487 5 3	3 830 5 3
	OUDH					
LUCKNOW	Lucknow	118 10 0		17 9 9	112 3 6	129 13 3
	Unao				1 0 0	1 0 0
	Sitapur					
	Kheri	1 160 13 0		200 12 0		200 12 0
FYZABAD	Fyzabad	57 10 0		18 3 9	35 6 3	53 10 0
	Bahraich			19 3 6	466 10 9	485 14 3
	Gonda			75 1 11		75 1 11
	Bara Banki				18 7 9	18 7 9
	Partabgarh	27 6 9		3 11 9		3 11 9
	Total Oudh	1 364 7 9		334 10 8	633 12 3	968 6 11
	Total, N W P and Oudh	3,021 2 10	1 652 7 3	1 025 3 5	2 121 1 6	4 798 12 2

APPENDIX B

STATEMENT I.—*Return of civil suits and miscellaneous proceedings to which Municipal Boards were parties and which were pending before or finally decided by Courts of First Instance between October the 1st, 1892, and September the 30th, 1893.*

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Municipal Board, Plaintiff.								Municipal Board, Defendant.							
			No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.	No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.			Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
MEERUT	Saháranpur	Saháranpur	...	..	...	...	..	...	...	..	..	1	40 0 0	...	1	.	...	14 10 6	.	...
	Aligarh	Aligarh	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	25 0 0	1	.	...	...	...	...	...
AGRA	Muttra	Muttra‖	..	...	...	..	...	..	..	...	...	6	203 0 0	1	2	*3	...	89 0 0	...	...
		Brindaban‖	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	109 0 0	..	1	†2	...	49 0 0	1	25 0 0
	Etah	Kasganj	...	‡ 3	273 4 9	...	..	...	...	‡3	273 4 9	...	..	..	..	..	...	...	..	...
ROHILKHAND	Badaun	Badaun	...	‡ 1	14 10 0	1	...	...	...	.	...	1	10 0 0	...	1	.	...	10 0 0	...	...
	Bareilly	Bareilly	...	...	...	...	.	...	...	...	..	1	100 0 0	1	..	...	...	..	...	...
	Pilibhít	Pilibhít	...	...	...	...	...	..	...	.	...	1	130 0 0	1	...	...	...	...		...
ALLAHABAD	Cawnpore	Cawnpore	...	...	...	...	...	.	...	...	...	2	1,026 0 0	1	...	..	...	...	1	1,001 0 0
	Allahabad	Allahabad	...	.	...	.	...	...	...	...	...	1	100 0 0	...	1	..	...	25 0 0	...	..
	Jalaun	Kalpi	...		..	...	...	...	..	...	..	1	1,163 9 9	1	...	...	..	...	...	...
BENARES	Benares	Benares	...	14	3,150 15 3	10	...	...	..	2,432 11 0	4 718 4 3	3	139 14 0	2	.	...	...	...	1	50 0 0
	Total, N.-W. Provinces		...	18	3,438 14 0	11	...	..	...	2,447 5 0	7 991 9 0	22	3,046 7 9	8	6	5	...	187 10 6	3	1,076 0 0
	OUDH																			
LUCKNOW	Lucknow	Lucknow	...	...	...	...	...	...	..		...	3	2,225 12 9		3	...	...	1,381 6 10	..	..
	Hardoi	Hardoi	...	1	16 6 0	1	..	...	16 6 0	...	...	...	..	...	...	...	...		..	..
FYZABAD	Fyzabad	Fyzabad	...	1	100 0 0	..	...	...	...	1	100 0 0	5	973 0 0	..	...	..	§1	...	4	913 0 0
	Bahraich	Bahraich	...	...	..	...	...	...	..	...	...	1	257 1 6	...	..	...	.	...	1	257 1 6
		Total, Oudh	..	2	116 6 0	1	...	...	...	16 6 0	1 100 0 0	9	3,455 14 3	.	3		1	1,381 6 10	5	1,170 1 6
		TOTAL, N.-W. P AND OUDH	.	20	3,555 4 0	12	...	...	...	2,463 11 0	8 1,091 9 0	31	6,502 6 0	8	9	5	1	1,569 1 4	8	2,246 1 6

* Value Rs 65-0-0.
† Value Rs. 35-0-0.
‡ These are execution of decree cases.
‖ These Boards were not shown separately last year.
§ Value Rs. 60-0-0.

APPENDIX B

STATEMENT II.—*Return of civil suits to which Municipal Boards were parties and which were pending before or finally decided by District Courts of Appeal between October the 1st, 1892, and September the 30th, 1893.*

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Municipal Board, Appellant.									Municipal Board, Respondent.								
			No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided.				Amount decreed.	No. of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided.				Amount decreed.	No. of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.
					For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.						For.	Against.	Compromised	Withdrawn.			
	N.-W. PROVINCES.			Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Meerut ...	Ghaziabad ...	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	..	...	1	20 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	..
ROHILKHAND ...	Badaun ...	Badaun ...	...	...	...	...	..	...	...	..	...	1	150 0 0	1	..	...	...	...	...	...
	Bareilly	Bareilly ...	..	...	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	1	100 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Pilibhit	Pilibhit ...	.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	130 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ...	.	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	25 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Allahabad ..	Allahabad .	1	15 4 0	1	...	...	...	15 4 0	...	...	1	75 0 0	1	..	...	...	...	...	...
	Jalaun	Kalpi ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,163 9 9	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,163 9 9
BENARES	Benares	Benares ...	..	.	.	.	..	..	. .	...	...	4	637 14 0	2	...	...	...	. .	2	607 14 0
	Jaunpur	Jaunpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	47 0 0	1	...	...	...	.	.	...
	Total, N. W Provinces	...	1	15 4 0	1		..	...	15 4 0	...	...	12	2,318 7 9	9	...	...	...	..	3	1,771 7 9
	OUDH.																			
LUCKNOW ..	Lucknow ...	Lucknow ...	..	...	...	...	...		...	...	...	2	1,579 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	2	1,579 0 0
	Total, Oudh ..	...	.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1,579 0 0	...	...	...	...	..	2	1,579 0 0
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh.	...	1	15 4 0	1	...	...	...	15 4 0	...	...	14	3,897 7 9	9	...	...	...	...	5	3,350 7 9

*This Municipal Board was wrongly shown by Chairman as Appellant in the two appeals valued Rs. 30 pending last year.

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT III.—*Suits to which Municipal Boards were parties and which were pending before or finally decided by the Privy Council, High Court, N.-W. Provinces, and Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, between October the 1st, 1892, and September the 30th, 1893.*

Division.	District.	Municipality	Municipal Board, Appellant									Municipal Board, Respondent.									Remarks.
			No. for disposal.	Value of claims	Decided. For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn	Amount decreed	No of appeals pending	Value of claims pending	No for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Against	Compromised	Withdrawn	Amount decreed.	No of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	
				Rs a p					Rs. a p		Rs. a p.		Rs. a p					Rs a p.		Rs a p.	
	N-W PROVINCES.																				
AGRA ...	Mainpuri ...	Mainpuri	1	700 0 0	1	.	.	...	700 0 0	...	...		...	...	...	...	...		1	...	...
BENARES ...	Jaunpur	Jaunpur ...	1	2 0 0	..	1	.		...	..	...		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...
	Total, N.-W Provinces .	...	2	702 0 0	1	1	...	...	700 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...	...
	OUDH																				
	Nil																				
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh,	..	2	702 0 0	1	1	...	...	700 0 0	...	.			...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT IV (No. I.)—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of Municipal Boards was realized or remitted during the year* 1892-93, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *October* 1893.

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Sums outstanding on the 1st October 1892.			Awarded to Municipal Boards between 1st October 1892 and 30th September 1893			Total.			Realized during 1892 93.		
			Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.
	N.-W. PROVINCE.		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Dehra Dún ...	Dehra Dún* ...	...	...	...	...	...	. .	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Saháranpur ...	Saháranpur ...	...	...	8 2 0	..	...	1 8 0	...	...	9 10 0	...	...	9 10 0
	Meerut ...	Ghaziabad ...	...	...	11 14 6	...	...	2 1 6	...	...	14 0 0	...	...	14 0 0
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	Muttra ...	...	...	...	...	.	10 11 0	...	...	10 11 0	...	...	4 1 0
		Brindaban ...	...	...	...	...	...	4 0 0	...	...	4 0 0	...	...	4 0 0
	Etah ...	Kasganj ...	179 0 0	59 5 0	66 4 0	...	...	...	179 0 0	59 5 0	66 4 0	...	...	...
	Mainpuri ...	Mainpuri ...	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	...
ROHILKHAND,	Badaun ...	Badaun ...	...	...	14 10 0	...	...	9 8 0	...	...	24 2 0	...	. .	15 10 0
	Bareilly ...	Bareilly ...	...	...	...	...	...	10 0 0	...	...	10 0 0	. .	...	...
	Pilibhit ...	Pilibhit ...	...	...	1 8 0	...	. .	7 0 0	...	...	8 8 0	...	...	1 8 0
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore . .	Cawnpore ...	1,063 3 0	...	105 12 4	...	. .	.	1,063 3 0	...	105 12 4	114 2 8	...	84 0 4
	Jalaun ..	Kalpi ...	...	...	...	...	0 5 0	63 4 0	...	0 5 0	63 4 0	...	0 5 0	63 4 0
BENARES ...	Benares ...	Benares ...	982 8 0	210 6 6	164 5 0	2,432 11 0	149 15 8	346 8 0	3,415 3 0	360 6 2	510 13 0	413 4 0	29 7 4	109 3 6
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...		2,224 11 0	269 11 6	372 15 10	2,432 11 0	150 4 8	454 8 6	4,657 6 0	420 0 2	827 8 4	527 6 8	29 12 4	306 4 10
	OUDH.													
LUCKNOW ...	Hardoi ...	Hardoi ...	...	...	...	16 6 0	...	3 9 0	16 6 0	...	3 9 0	16 6 0	...	3 9 0
	Total, Oudh ...		...	...	...	16 6 0	...	3 9 0	16 6 0	...	3 9 0	16 6 0	...	3 9 0
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh ...		2,224 11 0	269 11 6	372 15 10	2,449 1 0	150 4 8	458 1 6	4,673 12 0	420 0 2	831 1 4	543 12 8	29 12 4	308 13 10

The Chairman reports that the balance of Rs. 103-4-0 erroneously shown as outstanding in previous returns was adjusted, long ago.

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT IV. (No. II.).—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of Municipal Boards was realized or remitted during the year* 1892-93, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1*st of October* 1893—(concluded).

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Balance.			Remitted.			Net Total.			Analysis of balance.		
			Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Recoverable.	Irrecoverable.	Doubtful.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	Muttra ...	...	...	6 10 0	...	...	...	...	...	6 10 0	6 10 0	...	...
	Etah ...	Kasganj ...	179 0 0	59 5 0	66 4 0	...	...	...	179 0 0	59 5 0	66 4 0	...	304 9 0	...
	Mainpuri ...	Mainpuri ...	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	0 8 0	0 8 0	...	...
ROHILKHAND ...	Badaun ...	Badaun ...	...	...	8 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	8 8 0	8 8 0	...	...
	Bareilly ...	Bareilly ...	...	...	10 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	10 0 0	10 0 0	...	...
	Pilibhit ...	Pilibhit ...	...	...	7 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	7 0 0	7 0 0	...	...
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ...	949 0 4	...	21 12 0	...	...	...	949 0 4	...	21 12 0	156 12 0	814 0 4	...
BENARES ...	Benares ...	Benares ...	3,001 15 0	330 14 10	401 9 6	...	...	...	3,001 15 0	330 14 10	401 9 6	2,511 0 6	227 13 8	985 9 2
	OUDH.													
	Nil.													
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh.	...	4,129 15 4	390 3 10	522 3 6	...	...	...	4,129 15 4	390 3 10	522 3 6	2,709 6 6	1,356 7 0	985 9 2

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by Municipal Boards under decrees of the Court between 1st October 1892 and 30th September 1893.*

Division.	District	Municipality	Receipts	Nature of disbursements: Amount including costs awarded against Municipal Boards in regular suits.	In prosecution.	In defence.	Total	Remarks.
			Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs. a p	Rs a. p	Rs a. p.	
		N.-W. PROVINCES.						
MEERUT	Saháranpur	Saháranpur ...	9 10 0	14 10 6	...	32 0 0	46 10 6	
	Meerut	Gházíabad ..	14 0 0	.	..	2 10 6	2 10 6	
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	Muttra ...	4 1 0	9 12 0	..	40 4 6	50 0 6	
		Brindaban .	4 0 0		.	13 10 0	13 10 0	
	Mainpuri ..	Mainpuri ...	...		29 8 0	...	29 8 0	
ROHILKHAND,	Badaun	Badaun	15 10 0		1 8 0	30 10 0	32 2 0	
	Bareilly ..	Bareilly	...	...	...	51 11 0	51 11 0	
	Pilibhít .	Pilibhít	1 8 0	.	...	7 0 0	7 0 0	
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore	Cawnpore	198 3 0		4 9	4 1 6	7 6 3	
	Allahabad	Allahabad ..	.	...		15 4 0	15 4 0	
	Jalaun	Kalpi ...	63 9 0	..	..	79 2 0	79 2 0	
BENARES	Benares	Benares	551 14 10	..	398 1 0	27 3 0	425 4 0	
	Jaunpur	Jaunpur	...	.	23 10 0	1 12 0	25 6 0	
	Total, North-Western Provinces ...		862 7 10	24 6 6	456 15 9	305 4 6	785 10 9	
		OUDH.						
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow ...	Lucknow		1,564 13 2	...	187 5 0	1,752 2 2	
	Hardoi .	Hardoi	19 15 0		1 5 0	...	1 5 0	
FYZABAD	Fyzabad ...	Fyzabad ...		..	10 8 0	4 0 0	14 8 0	
	Bahraich ...	Bahraich			...	170 5 6	170 5 6	
	Total, Oudh ..		19 15 0	1,564 13 2	11 13 0	361 10 6	1,938 4 8	
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh ...		882 6 10	1,589 3 8	467 12 9	666 15 0	2,723 15 5	

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT I.—*Return of Civil Suits to which the Court of Wards was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by Courts of First Instance, between October the 1st, 1892, and September the 30th, 1893.*

District.	Estate.	Estate, Plaintiff.								Estate, Defendant.							
		No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.	No. for disposal.	Value of claims	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
ALIGARH ...	Dadon Haidyar Khan ...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,100 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
MEERUT ...	Ram Saran Das ...	1	75 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Murari Lal ...	1	297 5 6	1	...	...	...	99 0 2	...	...	2	637 9 9	2	...	...	...	...	.	...
ETÁWAH	Harchandpur ...	1	1,545 8 4	1	...	...	...	1,499 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...
ETÁWAH	Sahanpur ...	1	1,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	..	1	1,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...
BIJNOR ...	Mohan Singh ...	1	91 10 9	1	...	...	...	91 10 9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
BAREILLY ...	Mathopur ...	2	33,399 8 10	...	1	...	...	...	1	1,400 0 0	1	1,06,800 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Hari Singh ..	4	800 7 3	3	...	...	...	680 9 3	1	119 14 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
CAWNPORE ...	Pandit Amar Nath ...	...	..	...	...	...	...	..	...	..	1	514 2 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Janki Parshad ...	1	98 9 6	...	...	...	...	...	1	98 9 6	1	1,13,150 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
FATEHPUR ...	Kasimpur ...	..	...	1	...	...	...	...	..	...	3	47,656 15 2	...	...	...	...	...	3	47,656 15 2
	Bara	1	1,210 0 0	...	...	...	...	1,019 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
ALLAHABAD ...	Raghuraj Singh ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	47 9 8	...	1	...	..	47 9 8	...	...
	Confiscated Estates ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	300 0 0	...	..	...	..	...	1	300 0 0
BÁNDA ...	Ganesh Singh ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,700 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
AZAMGARH ..	Sarai Mir	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	418 14 6	3	...	...	...	...	...	...
MAINPURI ...	Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	60 12 7	...	...	4	...	...	...	...
GORAKHPUR ...	Babu Sikhir Chand ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	275 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Chanmokha	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,645 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
BASTI ...	Fida Hussain	1	1,833 0 0	..	...	...	...	..	1	1,833 0 0	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
PILIBHÍT ...	Ghunchai	2	136 6 6	2	...	...	...	136 6 6	...	...	2	96,898 8 7	1	...	1	...	...	...	...
	Ahmadyar Khan ...	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	33,000 0 0	..	...	...	...	...	1	33,000 0 0
MORADABAD ...	Mobarik Hussain ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,000 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Anand Sarup ...	1	352 8 0	1	...	...	...	352 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...
	Mohib Ali Khan ..	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...	...	1	1,25,000 0 0	1	..	...	...	...	..	..
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...	17	40,840 0 8	10	2	...	...	3,879 0 8	5	4,451 7 6	27	5,32,204 8 3	16	1	5	...	47 9 8	5	80,956 15 2

* Value Rs. 96,836-8-7.

NOTE.—The Lachmi Narayan and Khamaria estates are no longer under Court of Wards' management

	OUDH.																														
Baba Banki ...	Pokhra	...	...	1	16,490	0	0	...	...	...	...	...		1	16,490	0	0	4	407	5	0	1	3	...	...	234	0	0	...	...	
	Mailarnigan	...	...	1	57	3	0	1	...	...	..	57	3	0	...	...		5	21,983	12	0	1	1	...	...	15	0	0	3	21,468	12	0
	Narauli	...	...	2	2,890	4	6	...	...	...	1	...		1	2,889	0	6	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...	
	Ramnagar	...	...	9	18,486	12	0	5	1	...	...	1,221	12	0	3	16,265	0	0	4	6,631	9	3	2	...	...	...			2	5,666	10	0
	Kharka	...	...	2	150	0	0	1	1	...	...	100	0	0	...	...			4	967	0	0	2	1	†1	...	10	0	0	...	...	
	Bhilwal	...	...	4	167	0	0	3	...	...	...	107	0	0	1	60	0	0	2	234	11	0	...	2	...	...	234	11	0	...	...	
	Akhyapur	...	...	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			2	2,300	0	0	1	...	*1	...	...			...	...	
	Surajpur	...	...	3	826	6	9	2	...	...	‡1	372	0	0	...	...			6	16,780	10	6	3	1	...	...	1,416	4	0	2	3,488	10	0
	Tanda	...	...	1	750	0	0	...	1	...	...	...			...	...			1	2,500	0	0	...	...	...	...	...			1	2,500	0	0
	Bishunpur	...	...	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			1	3,400	0	0	...	...	1	...	...			...	...	
Hardoi ...	Khajurahra	...	...	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			2	70	0	0	1	...	...	...	...			1	20	0	0
Kheri ...	Khairigarh	...	...	1	9,461	1	3	1	...	...	...	1,032	14	3	...	...			...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...	
	Kaimahra	...	...	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			1	80	0	0	1	...	...	...	...			...	...	
	Mallanpur	...	...	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			1	311	12	0	...	..	...	...	...			1	311	12	0
Sitapur ...	Akbarpur	...	...	1	100	0	0	...	...	...	...	...			1	100	0	0	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...	
Fyzabad ...	Khapradih	...	...	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			2	1,520	0	0	2	...	...	...	...			...	...	
	Karwar	...	...	2	2,103	0	0	1	...	...	1	2,000	0	0	...	...			...	....			...	...	...	...	...			...	...	
	Musepur	...	...	1	9,815	1	6	1	...	...	...	5,960	0	6	...	...			...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...	
Bahraich ...	Rahwa	...	...	3	830	9	2	2	...	...	...	193	2	0	1	568	2	9	1	48	7	0	1	...	...	...	...			...	...	
Rae Bareli ...	Tiloi	...	...	2	506	9	0	...	...	...	...	...			2	506	9	0	4	979	3	0	2	1	...	...	428	0	0	1	526	3	0
	Bhiragobindpur	...	...	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			2	33	0	0	1	1	...	...	25	0	0	...	...		
	Pandriganeshpur	...	...	5	515	0	0	...	...	...	1	...			4	352	0	0	2	3,140	0	0	2	...	...	...	...			...	...	
	Rahua	...	...	3	48	2	0	2	...	...	1	38	2	0	...	...			...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...	
Unao ...	Madarnagar	...	...	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			1	21,967	8	0	...	1	...	...	21,967	8	0	...	...		
	Malauna	...	...	1	222	4	0	...	...	...	...	...			1	222	4	0	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...	
	Gayanpur	...	...	...	....			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			1	(a)1,010	0	0	1	...	...	...	1,010	(	0	...	...	
Sultanpur ...	Rampur	...	...	1	18,455	2	1½	...	...	...	...	...			1	18,455	2	1½	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...	
	Walipur	...	...	1	44	0	0	1	...	...	...	44	0	0	...	...			...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...	
	Karwar	...	...	3	1,700	2	8	2	...	...	...	63	3	2	1	1,636	15	6	4	220	4	0	2	...	...	...	...			2	38	12	0
Partabgarh ...	Bargaon	...	...	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			1	2,00,000	0	0	...	...	...	...	...			1	2,00,000	0	0
	Total, Oudh	...		47	83,608	9	11½	22	3	...	5	11,189	4	11	17	57,545	1	10½	51	2,84,585	1	9	23	11	3	...	25,340	7	0	14	2,34,020	11	0
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh	...		64	124,448	10	7½	32	5	...	5	15,068	5	7	22	61,996	9	4½	78	8,16,789	10	0	39	12	8	...	25,388	0	8	19	3,14,977	10	2

* Value Rs. 2,000 0 0.
† Do. 730 0 0.
‡ Do. 334 10 9.

(a) The value of this suit was shown as Rs. 210 last year. The value of a 2 biswas share Rs. 800, also sued for, has now been included.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT I.—*Return of Civil Suits to which the Court of Wards was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by Courts of First Instance, between October the 1st, 1892, and September the 30th, 1893.*

District.	Estate.	Estate, Plaintiff.									Estate, Defendant.								
		No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided.				Amount decreed.	No. of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.	No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided.				Amount decreed.	No. of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.
				For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.						For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.			
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
ALIGARH ...	Dadon Haidyar Khan ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,100 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
MEERUT ...	Ram Saran Das ...	1	75 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Murari Lal ...	1	297 5 6	1	...	...	...	99 0 2	...	...	2	637 9 9	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
ETÁWAH ...	Murari Lal ...	1	1,545 8 4	1	...	...	...	1,499 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Harchandpur ...	1	1,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
BIJNOR ...	Sahaspur ...	1	91 10 9	1	...	...	...	91 10 9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
BAREILLY ...	Mohan Singh ...	2	33,399 8 10	...	1	...	...	...	1	1,400 0 0	1	1,06,800 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Mukhopar ...	4	800 7 3	3	...	...	...	680 9 3	1	119 14 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Hari Singh ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	514 2 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
CAWNPORE ...	Pandit Amar Nath ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,13,150 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Janki Parshad ...	1	96 9 6	...	...	...	...	...	1	98 9 6	3	47,656 15 2	...	...	...	...	...	3	47,656 15 2
FATEHPUR ...	Kasimpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bara	1	1,210 0 0	1	...	...	...	1,019 6 0	...	...	1	47 9 8	...	1	...	...	47 9 8	...	...
ALLAHABAD ...	Raghuraj Singh ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	300 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	300 0 0
	Confiscated Estates ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,700 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
BÁNDA ...	Ganesh Singh ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	418 14 6	3	...	...	...	...	...	...
AZAMGARH ...	Sarai Mir ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	60 12 7	...	...	4	...	...	...	...
MAINPURI ...	Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	275 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
GORAKHPUR ...	Babu Sikhir Chand ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,645 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Chaumokha ...	1	1,833 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,833 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
BASTI ...	Fida Husain ...	2	136 6 6	2	...	...	...	136 6 6	...	...	2	96,898 8 7	1	...	*1	...	...	...	...
PILIBHÍT ...	Ghunchai ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	33,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	33,000 0 0
	Ahmadyar Khan ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,000 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Mobarik Husain ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
MORADABAD ...	Anand Sarup ...	1	352 8 0	1	...	...	...	352 8 0	...	...	1	1,25,000 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Mohib Ali Khan ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...									
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...	17	40,840 0 8	10	2	...	...	3,879 0 8	5	4,451 7 6	27	5,33,204 8 3	16	1	5	...	47 9 8	5	80,956 15 2

* Value Rs. 96,836-8-7.

NOTE.—The Lachmi Narayan and Khamaria estates are no longer under Court of Wards' management.

OUDH.

Bara Banki	Pokhra	...	...	1	16,490	0	0	...	...	...	..	...			1	16,490	0	0	4	407	5	0	1	3	...	...	234	0	0	.	.	.
	Mailaraiganj	...	...	1	57	3	0	1	...	...	...	57	3	0		...			5	21,983	12	0	1	1	...	...	15	0	0	3	21,468	12	0
	Narauli	..	...	2	2,890	4	6	...	..	...	1	...			1	2,889	0	6		...			...	...	...	...	...			.	...	
	Ramnagar	...	...	9	18,486	12	0	5	1	..	...	1,221	12	0	3	16,265	0	0	4	6,631	9	3	2	...	..	..	...			2	5,666	10	0
	Kharka	...	...	2	150	0	0	1	1	...	...	100	0	0	...	..			4	967	0	0	2	1	†1	...	10	0	0	...	...		
	Bhilwal	...	...	4	167	0	0	3	..	...	...	107	0	0	1	60	0	0	2	234	11	0	.	2	...	...	234	11	0	...	...		
	Akbyapur	...	...	...	.			..	...	...	.	...			...	...			2	2,800	0	0	1		*1	...					...		
	Surajpur	...	...	3	826	6	9	2		...	‡1	372	0	0	...	...			6	16,780	10	6	3	1	...	...	1,416	4	0	2	3,488	10	0
	Tanda	..	...	1	750	0	0	...	1	...	.	...			..	...			1	2,500	0	0	.	...	...	...	...			1	2,500	0	0
	Bishunpur	...	...	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			1	3,400	0	0	...	...	1	...	..			...			
Hardoi ...	Khajurahra	...	...	...	...			...	...	..	...	...			...	...			2	70	0	0	1	.	..	...	...			1	20	0	0
Kheri ...	Khairigarh	...	...	1	9,461	1	3	1	...	...	...	1,032	14	3	...	...			...	. .			..	. .	...	...	...			...	...		
	Kaimahra	...	...	.	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			1	80	0	0	1	...	...	...	...			...	...		
	Mallanpur	...	...	.	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			1	311	12	0	...	..	...	...	...			1	311	12	0
Sitapur ...	Akbarpur	...	...	1	100	0	0	...	..	...	...	...			1	100	0	0	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...		
Fyzabad	Khspradih	...	...	.	...			..	...	...	...	...			...	...			2	1,520	0	0	2	...	...	...	...			...	...		
	Karwar	...	...	2	2,103	0	0	1	...	...	1	2,000	0	0	...	...			..	..			...	...	...	...	...			...	...		
	Musepur	..	...	1	9,815	1	6	1	...	...	...	5,960	0	6	...	...			...	...			...	...	...	...	...			..	...		
Bahraich ..	Bahwa	...	...	3	820	9	2	2	...	...	...	193	2	0	1	568	2	9	1	48	7	0	1	...	...	...	...			...	...		
Rae Bareli ...	Tiloi	...	...	2	506	9	0	...	...	...	...	...			2	506	9	0	4	979	3	0	2	1	...	..	428	0	0	1	526	3	0
	Bhiragobindpur	...	...	...	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...			2	33	0	0	1	1	...	...	25	0	0	...	...		
	Pandrigaaeshpur	..	...	5	515	0	0	...	...	..	1	...			4	352	0	0	2	3,140	0	0	2	...	..	...	...			...	...		
	Bahua	...	...	3	48	2	0	2	...	..	1	38	2	0	...	...				...			...	...	...	...	...			...	...		
Unao ...	Madarnagar	...	...	...	...			...	..	...	...	...			...				1	21,967	8	0	...	1	..	...	21,967	8	0	.	.	...	
	Malaunn	...	..	1	222	4	0	.	...	...	...	...			1	222	4	0	..	...			...	...	...	...	...			..	...		
	Gayanpur	...	...	...	...			...	...	..	...	...			...	...			1	(a)1,010	0	0	1	...	...	...	1,010	(	0	...	...		
Sultanpur ...	Rampur	...	...	1	18,455	2	1½	...	...	..	...	...			1	18,455	2	1½	...	...			. .	...	...	...	...			...	.		
	Walipur	...	...	1	44	0	0	...	...	...	...	44	0	0	...	.			..	...			...	...	...	...	...			...	.		
	Karwar	..	...	3	1,700	2	8	2	...	..	...	63	3	2	1	1,636	15	6	4	220	4	0	2	...	...	.	...			2	38	12	0
Partabgarh ...	Bargaon	...	...	...	..			. .	...	...	...	...			...	...			1	2,00,000	0	0	..	...	...	...	.			1	2,00,000	0	0
	Total, Oudh	...		47	83,608	9	11½	22	3		5	11,189	4	11	17	57,545	1	10½	51	2,84,585	1	9	23	11	3	...	25,340	7	0	14	2,34,020	11	0
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh	.		64	124,448	10	7½	32	5	...	5	15,068	5	7	22	61,996	9	4½	78	8,16,789	10	0	39	12	8	...	25,388	0	8	19	3,14,977	10	2

* Value Rs. 2,000 0 0.
† Do. 730 0 0.
‡ Do. 334 10 9.

(a) The value of this suit was shown as Rs. 210 last year. The value of a 2 biswas share Rs. 800, also sued for, has now been included.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT.—I (*a*).—*Return of Miscellaneous Applications to which the Court of Wards was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by Courts of First Instance between October the 1st, 1892, and September the 30th, 1893.*

District	Estate.	Estate, Plaintiff.									Estate, Defendant.								
		No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of applications pending.	Value of claims pending.	No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of applications pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
ETÁWAH	Harchandpur	2	1,662 8 0	1	..	..	..	1,499 8 0	1	163 0 0	...	.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Roshangpur	2	1,620 5 11	.	...	...	...		2	1,620 5 11	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SHÁHJAHÁNPUR	Ramrauli	1	862 6 0	1	...	...	...	*300 0 0	...	...	...	.	...	...	...	...	...	..	..
	Marli Khera	3	981 12 6	...	...	...	...	...	3	981 12 6	...	.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bhatpura	3	354 14 3	...	...	1	...	..	2	108 2 3	...	.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Azizganj	1	108 14 3	.	..	...	...	...	1	108 14 3	..	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...
BIJNOR	Amandi	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	307 0 0	...	1	..	...	307 0 0	...	...
FATEHPUR	Kasimpur	...	..	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	4,954 9 4½	1	..	...	...	...	1	602 8 0
MAINPURI	Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad.	4	‡11,055 11 1	1	...	...	...	7,944 7 4	3	3,111 3 9	..	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
GHÁZIPUR	Gauri Shankar	1	22,209 10 7	...	.	...	1	...	...	...	...	..	...	.	...	...	...	...	...
	Total N.-W. Provinces ...	17	38,856 2 7	3	...	1	1	9,743 15 4	12	6,093 6 8	3	5,161 9 4½	1	1	...	...	307 0 0	1	602 8 0
	OUDH.																		
	Mailarsiganj	2	1,271 10 7	1	...	...	...	68 5 0	1	1,203 5 7	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Pokhra	1	19 10 6	1	...	...	...	19 10 6	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Tanda	1	360 10 0	1	...	...	...	360 10 0	...	...	1	203 8 6	...	1	...	...	203 8 6	...	...
BARA BANKI	Narauli	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,606 15 9	...	1	...	...	1,606 15 9	...	...
	Kharka	3	63 7 0	3	...	...	...	63 7 0	...	...	...	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...
	Ramnagar	7	1,931 8 6	3	3	...	...	1,134 12 6	1	34 14 0	1	6,880 11 11	...	1	...	...	6,880 11 11	...	...
	Bhilwal	1	29 0 0	..	...	...	...	...	1	29 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Surajpur	24	14,556 10 11	13	4	...	...	5,561 12 5	7	8,323 3 3	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
HARDOI	Khajurahra	1	14 12 0	1	...	...	...	14 12 0	...	...	1	906 8 9	...	...	...	...	...	1	905 8 9
KHERI	Khairigarh	12	9,338 3 9	5	1	...	...	3,690 0 6	6	4,802 4 9	4	4,147 9 3	1	3	...	...	75 15 0	..	...
	Kaimahra	4	1,014 7 0	3	†1	...	...	414 7 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Mullanpur	3	6,433 3 3	1	...	...	...	750 14 0	2	5,682 5 3	2	49,633 0 4	...	...	...	...	...	2	40,538 0 4
SITAPUR	Akbarpur	1	154 10 6	...	...	...	...	...	1	154 10 6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bahora	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	No value given	...	2	...	...	No value given	...	...
	Bajehra	3	No value ...	..	1	...	...	...	2	No value ..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Tiloi	5	1,718 10 0	3	...	...	...	1,429 3 0	2	284 7 0	1	17 6 3	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
RAE BARELI	Binohra	1	85 11 0	1	...	...	...	85 11 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bahua	1	401 6 0	1	...	...	...	401 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Chandrigancshpur	5	4,361 1 2	3	1	...	...	4,002 12 8	1	341 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Waliper	1	5 10 0	1	...	...	...	5 10 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SULTÁNPUR	Karwar	5	158 0 8	5	...	...	...	158 0 8	...	...	3	106 12 3	2	...	...	...	...	1	99 4 3
	Rampur	1	1,883 14 0	1	...	...	...	1,883 14 0	...	...	2	2,401 10 2	1	...	...	...	...	1	1,244 4 1
UNAO	Malaona	2	471 15 5	...	...	...	...	...	2	471 15 0	1	No value ...	1	...	..	...	...	.	...
	Total, Oudh ...	84	44,319 2 3	47	11	...	...	20045 4 3	26	21,332 1 4	19	65,993 3 2	6	8	...	...	8,767 3 2	5	51,782 1 5
	TOTAL, N.-W. P. AND OUDH ...	101	83,175 4 10	50	11	1	1	29,789 3 7	38	27,425 8 0	23	71,154 12 6½	7	9	...	...	9,074 3 2	6	52,384 9 5

* Remainder struck off in consideration of defendant paying a fixed rent for his *sir* holding.
† This was an application for the release of a house.
‡ The decree valued Rs. 54-8-0 was wrongly shown by Collector last year.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT 11.—*Return of civil suits to which the Court of Wards was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by District Courts of Appeal, between October the 1st, 1892, and September the 30th, 1893.*

District.	Estate.	Estate, Appellant.									Estate, Respondent.								
		No. for disposal.	Value of claims	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Murari Lal	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	..	4	3,564 1 8	1	...	...	...	..	3	3,133 6 8
CAWNPORE ..	Janki Parshad	1	1,612 8 6	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,612 8 6	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
ALLAHABAD ...	Raghuraj Singh	1	47 9 8	.	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
AZAMGARH ...	Sarai Mir	1	10 0 0	1	.	..	...	10 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
GORAKHPUR ...	Babu Sikhir Chand ...	...	...	...	..	...	...	...	..	...	3	418 14 6	...	...	...	...	...	3	418 14 6
	Total, N.-W P. .	3	1,670 2 2	1	1	...	...	10 0 0	1	1,612 8 6	1	200 0 0	...	1	...	...	200 0 0	...	...
											8	4,183 0 2	1	1	...	...	200 0 0	6	3,552 5 2
	OUDH.																		
BARA BANKI ...	Narauli	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	7,541 8 0	..	3	...	...	7,371 0 0	...	...
	Kharka	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	277 0 0	..	...	...	...	...	2	277 0 0
	Mailarsganj ...	...	...	...	...	..	...	..	...	...	2	45 0 0	...	2	...	...	45 0 0	...	...
	Surajpur ..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	9	14,459 8 0	5	1	...	...	3,590 0 0	3	6,771 8 3
	Rámnagar ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	6	5,813 12 0	...	*1	...	...	4,000 0 0	5	1,813 12 0
KHERI ..	Mullanpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	5,054 10 3	...	...	...	...	...	2	5,054 10 3
	Khairigarh	1	8,428 3 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	8,428 3 0	2	2,078 12 6	...	...	...	...	...	2	2,078 12 6
SITAPUR ...	Akbarpur	...	...	...	..	...	...	...	.	...	1	312 10 9	1	...	...	...	...	.	...
FYZABAD ...	Khapradih	...	...	...	..	...	...	...	..	...	1	585 0 0	...	...	..	...	...	1	585 0 0
	Musepur	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	130 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
RAE BARELI ..	Tiloi	3	1,328 15 3	2	..	...	...	888 15 3	1	425 0 0	2	307 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	1	277 0 0
	Bhiragobindpur ...	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	8 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Pandriganeshpur ...	.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	3,140 0 0	..	..	...	...	...	2	3,140 0 0
SULTÁNPUR {	Karwar	1	250 0 0	..	...	..	...	...	1	250 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Rámpur	...	...	...	.	...	...	...	...	.	1	400 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	5	10,002 2 3	2	...	...	...	888 15 3	3	9,113 3 0	35	40,152 13 6	10	7	...	...	15,006 0 0	18	19,997 11 0
	TOTAL, N.-W P. AND OUDH...	8	11,672 4 5	3	1	...	...	898 15 3	4	10,725 11 6	43	44,335 13 8	11	8	...	...	15,206 0 0	24	23,550 0 2

* Remanded under section 562, Civil Procedure Code.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT III.—*Suits to which the Court of Wards was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by the Privy Council, High Court, N.-W. Provinces, and Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, between October the 1st, 1892, and September the 30th, 1893.*

District.	Estate.	Estate, Appellant. No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	Estate, Respondent. No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	Remarks.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.	
MUZAFFARNAGAR ..	Sambalhera	1	7,791 5 6	-	...	...	...	-	1	7,791 5 6	-	...	...	...	-	...	..	-	..	
MEERUT ...	Ram Saran Das	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	-	-	1	142 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	142 8 0	
ETAWAH ...	Roshangpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	7,448 15 7	...	...	...	...	...	1	7,448 15 7	
BIJNOR ..	Anandi	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,097 14 3	..	1	...	...	1,097 14 3	-	...	
BAREILLY ...	Mashuk Mahal Begam ...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	44,917 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	44,917 0 0	
SHAHJAHANPUR	Khirya	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,500 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,500 0 0	
	Bhatpura ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,191 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,191 0 0	
CAWNPORE ...	Janki Parshad										1	1,13,150 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,13,150 0 0	
FATEHPUR ...	Kasimpur										2	32,902 0 0	*2	...	...	...	...	...	..	* Remanded for retrial on their merits.
AZAMGARH ...	Sarai Mir										1	5,798 0 0	...	1	-	-	359 3 6	-	..	
MAINPURI	Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad										1	* 8,709 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	..	.	
MORADABAD .	Mohib Ali Khan										1	5,151 7 6	1	...	...	...	...	..	.	
GHAZIPUR ...	Gauri Shankar	2	5,200 0 0	..	2	...	...	...	...	...	1	316 0 0	-	...	...	...	...	1	316 0 0	
GORAKHPUR	Majhauli										1	240 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	..	..	
	Babu Sikhir Chand ...										1	20,000 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	..	...	
	Bangaon										1	28,827 7 2	1	...	...	...	...	..	..	
	Total N.-W Provinces ...	3	12,991 5 6	-	2	...	...	...	1	7,791 5 6	16	2,72,391 4 6	7	2	-	..	1,457 1 9	7	1,69,665 7 7	
	OUDH.																			
	Tanda	-	-	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	7,189 11 9	...	...	...	...	...	2	7,189 11 9	Of these, one appeal for Rs 5,143 9-3 is pending before the Privy Council
	Naraili . ..	3	7,371 0 0	...	.	..	...	...	3	7,371 0 0	1	1,82,477 12 0	.	...	...	...	...	1	*1,82,477 12 7	
BARA BANKI	Bishunpur ...	1	12,107 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	12,107 2 0	-	-	-	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Kharka	..	..	..	..	..	...	...	...	...	1	13 4 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	..	*Pending before the Privy Council.
	Surajpur	†1	14,336 7 11	...	...	...	...	...	1	14,336 7 11	1	1,218 9 9	1	...	...	...	...	..	.	
KHERI	Mullanpur	1	41,830 0 7	...	...	...	...	...	1	41,830 0 7	1	100 0 0	-	...	...	...	...	1	100 0 0	† The appeal for Rs. 168-10 0 was wrongly shewn pending last year It was decided in favour of the Estate.
FYZABAD ...	Khapradih	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	9,331 15 0	1	...	...	...	...	-	-	
RAE BARELI	Tilot	(a)3	1,382 3 0	(a)2	.	...	...	(a)707 3 0	1	675 0 0	1	200 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	..	..	
UNAO	Malauna	1	222 4 0	(b) 1	...	..	..	...	..	...	-	...	-	...	...	...	...	.	...	
	Gayanpur	1	50 0 0	-	...	...	...	...	1	50 0 0	..	.	...	...	...	...	...	.	...	(a) Of these, one is an execution of decree valued Rs. 162-3-0.
	Total Oudh ...	11	77,299 1 6	3	...	...	...	707 3 0	8	76,369 10 6	8	2,01,031 4 6	4	...			.	4	1 89,767 8 4	(b) Remanded for retrial.
	Total N. W. P and Oudh ...	14	90,290 7 0	3	2	...	...	707 3 0	9	84,161 0 0	24	4,73,422 9 0	11	2	...	...	1,457 1 9	11	3,59,432 15 11	

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT IV. (No. I).—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Court of Wards was realized or remitted during the year* 1892-93, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October*, 1893.

District.	Estate.	*Sums outstanding on the 1st October*, 1892			*Awarded to Court of Wards between 1st October*, 1892 *and 30th September* 1893.			*Total.*			*Realized during* 1892-93.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Ram Saran Das ...	...	...	8 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	8 2 0	...	...	8 2 0
	Murari Lal ...	311 4 4	49 6 9	38 15 9	72 14 2	30 1 6	34 5 0	384 2 6	79 8 3	73 4 9	115 1 0	...	27 4 9
MUTTRA ...	Parshadi Lal ...	16 0 0	4 15 6	20 6 0	..	2 4 6	8 5 0	16 0 0	7 4 0	28 11 0	16 0 0	...	25 0 0
ETÁWAH ...	Roshangpur ...	796 10 11	210 14 2	719 12 0	..	68 0 6	...	796 10 11	278 14 8	719 12 0	50 0 0	...	10 0 0
	Harchandpur ...	...	...	1,499 8 0	146 0 0	9 4 0	22 12 0	146 0 0	9 4 0	1,522 4 0	...	...	1,522 4 0
MAINPURI ...	Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad ...	8,837 15 4	1,782 0 0	348 6 6	...	362 1 1	413 2 3	8,837 15 4	2,144 1 1	761 8 9	6,458 7 4	1,610 4 1	468 1 9
MORADABAD ...	Anand Sarup ..	*352 8 0	*45 4 0	*52 1 3	...	...	...	352 8 0	45 4 0	52 1 3	...	...	...
	Mohib Ali Khan ...	...	...	...	...	..	1,933 15 0	...	...	1,933 15 0	...	...	...
BAREILLY ...	Mashuk Mahal Begam	6,768 4 0	504 13 9	2,664 14 3	...	232 4 11	...	6,768 4 0	737 2 8	2,664 14 3	...	...	...
	Mohan Singh ...	...	...	...	78 0 0	14 15 10	9 0 0	78 0 0	14 15 10	9 0 0	..	..	...
	Madhopur ...	...	...	...	...	...	1,050 0 0	..	..	1,050 0 0	...	...	..
	Hari Singh ...	...	..	.	239 0 0	450 2 1	102 15 0	239 0 0	450 2 1	102 15 0	...	...	...
PILIBHÍT ...	Ghunchai ...	...	.	...	136 6 6	...	19 14 10	136 6 6	...	19 14 10	31 8 3	...	• 2 7 0
SHÁHJAHÁNPUR	Azizganj ...	†105 9 3	...	...	108 14 3	...	...	214 7 6	...	...	...	...	...
	Bhatpura ...	240 3 2	41 0 0	42 11 0	...	0 2 0	...	240 3 2	41 2 0	42 11 0	...	...	...
	Khirya ...	...	...	90 1 4	...	...	...	...	...	90 1 4	...	...	90 1 4
	Bamrauli ...	...	..	...	862 6 0	...	...	862 6 0	...	...	300 0 0	..	...
	Murli Khera ...	...	...	...	976 3 6	5 9 0	...	976 3 6	5 9 0	...	41 0 0	...	...
ALLAHABAD ...	B. Bindeshri Parshad	...	...	..	‡2,625 12 9	‡3 12 9	‡33 3 0	2,625 12 9	3 12 9	33 3 0	65 11 0	...	...
	Bara ...	5,535 10 0	830 5 3	777 0 0	1,019 6 0	305 7 10	248 14 6	6,555 0 0	1,135 13 1	1,025 14 6	2,081 10 3	894 6 6	736 10 9
CAWNPORE ..	Amar Nath ..	...	...	...	...	...	242 10 0	...	...	242 10 0	...	...	...
	Misri Lal ...	..	..	63 2 0	...	...	..	..	...	63 2 0	...	...	18 5 0
	Janki Pershad .	.	...	...	...	...	1,090 6 0	...	...	1,090 6 0	...	...	1,090 6 0
FATEHPUR ...	Kasimpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	35 2 0	...	...	35 2 0	...	...	
HÁNDÍA ...	Ganesh Singh ...	...	...	...	...	...	131 8 0	...	...	131 8 0	...	..	131 8 0
AZAMGARH .	Sarsi Mir .	...	...	...	...	...	82 8 9	...	...	82 8 9	...	...	51 14 0
GHÁZIPUR ...	Gauri Shankar ..	15,175 9 11	5,691 7 4	3,060 7 8	..	910 8 8	18 8 2	15,175 9 11	6,602 0 0	3078 15 10	...	884 0 0	...
GORAKHPUR...	Babu Sikhir Chand...	6,164 7 2	168 4 1	523 14 0	...	412 15 10	814 5 9	6,164 7 2	581 3 11	1,338 3 9	606 11 6	349 9 6	128 11 0
	Majhauli ...	2,287 5 4	670 3 9	106 11 7	...	69 2 1	23 11 2	2,287 5 4	739 5 10	130 6 9	...	0 14 0	33 14 6
	Bangaon ..	...	...	...	...	...	4,630 15 7	...	...	4,630 15 7	...	...	...
	Total, N.-W. P ...	46,591 7 5	9,998 10 7	10,016 1 4	6,264 15 2	2,876 12 7	10,946 2 0	52,856 6 7	12,875 7 2	20,962 3 4	9,761 1 4	3,739 2 1	4,344 9 4

Note.—The Bhandara, Khawaria and Batak Parshad estates are no longer under Court of Wards management.

*The difference is due to the exclusion of a Revenue case balance wrongly included by Collector last year.

†The irrecoverable balance has been written off the accounts.

‡Collector reports that the estate having recently been taken over by the Court of Wards these figures cannot be relied on as strictly accurate.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT IV. (No. I)—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Court of Wards was realized or remitted during the year* 1892-93, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1*st of October* 1893.

District.	Estate	Sums outstanding on the 1st October 1892.			Awarded to Court of Wards between 1st October 1892, and 30th September 1893.			Total.			Realized during 1892-93.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.
	OUDH.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
BARA BANKI...	Pokhra ...	21 13 0	...	554 9 5	...	...	21 2 6	21 13 0	...	575 11 11	..	..	21 2 6
	Mailaraiganj ...	..	...	1,218 13 7	57 3 0	...	39 2 0	57 3 0	...	1,257 15 7	57 3 0	...	54 10 0
	Ramnagar ...	1,689 0 0	102 14 0	296 12 0	245 0 0	...	1,111 6 6	1,934 0 0	102 14 0	1,408 2 6	520 0 0	...	102 8 0
	Surajpur ...	12,573 10 0	...	§4,391 3 5	272 0 0	...	954 4 9	12,845 10 0	...	5,345 8 2	279 0 9	...	1,209 14 0
	Kharka ...	...	...	16 4 0	...	...	67 1 0	...	...	83 5 0	...	...	18 4 0
	Akhyapur ...	...	...	...	...	...	128 2 0	...	...	128 2 0	..	...	...
	Tanda	...	...	...	...	...	360 10 0	...	...	360 10 0	...	...	...
	Bhilwal ...	...	...	...	107 0 0	...	23 14 0	107 0 0	...	23 14 0	...	...	...
KHERI ...	Khairigarh ...	*6,197 15 9	4,153 3 4	1,493 12 0	1,032 14 3	344 5 3	352 3 10	7,230 14 0	4,497 8 7	1,845 15 10	2,293 2 0	1,321 12 10	420 14 9
	Mu.anpur ...	..	...	1,378 9 0	...	...	11 6 0	..	..	1,389 15 0	...	...	762 4 0
	Kaimahra ...	684 0 0	316 0 0	...	...	...	17 .0 0	684 0 0	316 0 0	17 0 0	84 0 0	316 0 0	17 0 0
HARDOI ...	Khajurahra ...	...	...	..	...	...	16 4 0	...	...	16 4 0	...	...	...
SITAPUR. ...	Akbarpur ...	†154 10 6	...	4 12 0	...	...	16 4 0	154 10 6	...	21 0 0	65 4 0	...	21 0 0
	Bahora ...	...	...	372 1 0	...	...	3 14 6	..	...	375 15 6	...	...	...
FYZABAD ...	Musepur ...	30 0 0	...	45 10 0	5,960 0 6	1,080 12 0	634 13 0	5,990 0 6	1,080 12 0	680 7 0	5,990 0 6	1,080 12 0	680 7 0
	Khapradih ...	...	...	608 13 9	...	...	125 3 0	..	...	934 0 9	...	...	815 6 8
	Kurwar ...	214 0 0	...	99 7 0	...	...	236 8 0	214 0 0	...	275 15 0	200 0 0	...	24 3 0
BAHRAICH ..	Rehwa	125 6 9	31 4 0	937 8 9	93 2 0	41 2 4	65 5 3	218 8 9	72 6 4	1,002 14 0	27 10 6	6 4 0	179 13 6
	Tiloi	...	...	162 3 0	1,265 8 3	10 8 0	1,272 10 0	1,265 8 3	10 8 0	1,434 13 0	354 6 3	10 8 0	44 4 0
RAE BARELI...	Bhiragobindpur ...	95 10 6	...	..	...	...	4. 7 0	95 10 6	...	4 7 0	...	...	...
	Pandriganeshpur ...	..	4 6 6	27 8 6	..	...	216 9 6	...	4 6 6	244 2 0	...	...	...
	Bahua	347 0 0	...	142 8 9	16 8 0	...	6 6 0	363 8 0	...	148 14 9	...	...	10 0 0
	Binohra ...	73 12 0	...	12 12 0	...	...	3 2 0	73 12 0	...	15 15 0	73 12 0	...	15 15 0
UNAO ...	Malauna ...	...	...	...	471†15 0	...	97 7 0	471 15 0	...	97 7 0	...	...	...
	Gayanpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	15 2 0	...	...	15 2 0	...	...	...
SULTÁNPUR ...	Rampur ...	600 0 0	358 6 0	1,371 6 1	...	...	67 5 3	600 0 0	358 6 0	1,438 11 4	600 0 0	358 6 0	155 14 3
	Walipur ...	8 13 6	...	0 6 0	...	...	7 4 0	8 13 6	...	7 10 0	2 2 0	...	7 10 0
	Kurwar ...	‡120 0 0	‡30 8 8	261 2 6	...	...	61 3 0	120 0 0	30 8 8	322 5 6	72 0 0	15 5 6	128 1 9
	Khapradih ...	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	...
PARTÁBGARH,	Bargaon ...	64 8 0	17 14 3	17 9 3	...	...	...	64 8 0	17 14 3	17 9 3	8 5 0	...	...
	Dehyawan ...	...	...	...	62 13 0	29 15 0	14 5 1	62 13 0	29 15 0	14 5 1	..	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	23,000 4 0	5,014 8 9	13,554 5 0	9,584 0 0	1,506 10 7	5,950 5 2	32,584 4 0	6,521 3 4	19,504 10 2	10,626 14 0	3,109 0 4	4,689 4 0
	TOTAL, N.-W. P. & O.	69,591 11 5	15,013 3 4	23,570 6 4	15,848 15 2	4,383 7 2	16,896 7 2	85,440 10 7	19,396 10 6	40,466 13 6	20,387 15 4	6,848 2 5	9,033 13 4

* Last year's balance was incorrect.
† Rs. 4-12-0 costs were wrongly included by Deputy Commissioner in the principal last year.
‡ Rs. 15-3-2 were wrongly included by Deputy Commissioner in the principal last year.
§ In one case Rs. 42 were reduced and in another Rs. 142 were added by order of the court.

APPENDIX C

STATEMENT IV (No II) —*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Court of Wards was realized or remitted during the year* 1892 93, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October* 1893—(concluded)

District	Estate	Balance			Remitted			Net Total			Analysis of Balance		
		Principal	Interest	Costs	Principal	Interest	Costs	Principal	Interest	Costs	Recoverable	Irrecoverable	Doubtful
	N W PROVINCES	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p
MEERUT	Murari Lal	269 1 6	79 8 3	46 0 9	141 0 3	35 3 0	21 15 3	128 1 3	44 5 3	24 1 6	196 8 0		
MUTTRA	Parsadi Lal		7 4 0	3 11 0		7 4 0	3 11 0						
ETAWAH	Roshangpur	746 10 11	278 14 8	709 12 0				746 10 11	278 14 8	709 12 0	1 735 5 7		
	Harchanpur	146 0 0	9 4 0					146 0 0	9 4 0		155 4 0		
MAINPURI	Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad	2 384 8 0	533 13 0	293 7 0				2,384 8 0	533 13 0	293 7 0	3,211 12 0		
MORADABAD	Anand Sarup	352 8 0	45 4 0	52 1 3				352 8 0	45 4 0	52 1 3	449 13 3		
	Mohib Ali Khan			1 938 15 0						1 933 15 0	1,933 15 0		
BAREILLY	Maahuk Mahal Begam	6,768 4 0	737 2 8	2 664 14 3				6,768 4 0	737 2 8	2 664 14 3	10 170 4 11		
	Mohan Singh	78 0 0	14 15 10	9 0 0				78 0 0	14 15 10	9 0 0	101 15 10		
	Madhopur			1 050 0 0						1 050 0 0	1 050 0 0		
PILIBHIT	Hari Singh	239 0 0	450 2 1	102 15 0				239 0 0	450 2 1	102 15 0	792 1 1		
	Ghunchai	104 14 3		17 7 10				104 14 3		17 7 10	122 6 1		
SHAHJAHANPUR	Azizganj	214 7 6						214 7 6			214 7 6		
	Bhatpura	240 3 2	41 2 0	42 11 0				240 3 2	41 2 0	42 11 0	320 11 3	3 4 11	
	Bamraula	562 6 0			562 6 0								
	Murli Khera	935 3 6	5 9 0					935 3 6	5 9 0		940 12 6		
ALLAHABAD	B Bindeshri Parshad	2,560 1 9	3 12 9	33 3 0				2,560 1 9	3 12 9	33 3 0	2 597 1 6		
	Bara	4,473 5 9	241 6 7	289 3 9	88 2 6			4,385 3 3	241 6 7	289 3 9	1,202 13 6	26 2 6	3 686 13 7
CAWNPORE	Amar Nath			242 10 0						242 10 0	242 10 0		
	Misri Lal			44 13 0						44 13 0		44 13 0	
FATEHPUR	Kasimpur			35 2 0						35 2 0	35 2 0		
AZAMGARH	Sarai Mir			30 10 9						30 10 9	30 10 9		
GHAZIPUR	Gauri Shankar	15 175 9 11	5,718 0 0	3 078 15 10			470 7 0	15,175 9 11	5 718 0 0	2,608 8 10		1 000 8 2	22 501 10 7
GORAKHPUR	Babu Sikhar Chand	5,557 11 8	231 10 5	1,209 8 9				5,557 11 8	231 10 5	1 209 8 9	6,998 14 10		
	Majhauli	2 287 5 4	738 7 10	96 8 3		0 4 2		2 287 5 4	738 3 8	96 8 3	3 122 1 3		
	Bansgaon			4,630 15 7						4,630 15 7	4,630 15 7		
	TOTAL N W PROVINCES	43 095 5 3	9,136 5 1	16,017 10 0	791 8 9	42 11 2	496 1 3	42,303 12 6	9,093 9 11	16 121 8 9	40,205 10 5	1 074 12 7	26,188 8 2

STATEMENT IV. (No. II.)—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Court of Wards was realized or remitted during the year* 1892-93, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October*, 1893.—(concluded).

District.	Estate.	Balance.			Remitted.			Net Total.			Analysis of Balance.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Recoverable.	Irrecoverable.	Doubtful.
	OUDH.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
BARA BANKI ...	Pokhra ...	21 13 0	...	554 9 5	...	...	...	21 13 0	...	554 9 5	554 9 5	...	21 13 0
	Mallaraiganj ...	...	...	1,203 5 7	...	...	...	...	...	1,203 5 7	1,203 5 7	...	...
	Ramnagar ...	1,414 0 0	102 14 0	1,305 10 6	...	...	...	1,414 0 0	102 14 0	1,305 10 6	1,401 4 6	1,421 4 0	...
	Surajpur ...	12,566 9 3	...	4,135 10 2	...	...	66 14 0	12,566 9 3	...	4,068 12 2	16,635 5 5	...	...
	Kharka ...	...	...	65 1 0	...	...	...	...	...	65 1 0	65 1 0	...	...
	Akhyapur ...	...	...	128 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	128 2 0	128 2 0	...	...
	Tanda ...	...	...	360 10 0	...	...	...	...	...	360 10 0	360 10 0	...	...
	Bhilwal ...	107 0 0	...	23 14 0	67 0 0	...	6 2 0	40 0 0	...	17 12 0	57 12 0	...	...
KHERI ...	Khairigarh ...	4 937 12 0	3,175 11 9	1,425 1 1	340 0 0	996 15 8	320 6 0	4,597 12 0	2,178 12 1	1,104 11 1	7,881 3 2	...	...
	Mullanpur ...	...	...	627 11 0	...	...	...	...	...	627 11 0	627 11 0	...	...
	Kaimahra ...	600 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	600 0 0	...	...	600 0 0	...	...
HARDOI ...	Khajuraha ...	...	...	16 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	16 4 0	14 12 0	1 8 0	...
SITAPUR ...	Akbarpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	89 6 6	...	...	89 6 6	...	...
	Bahora ...	...	...	375 15 6	...	...	281 4 6	...	...	94 11 0	94 11 0	...	...
FYZABAD ...	Khapradih ...	...	...	118 10 6	...	...	...	...	...	118 10 6	118 10 0	0 0 6	...
	Karwar ...	14 0 0	...	251 12 0	...	...	235 8 0	14 0 0	...	16 4 0	...	30 4 0	...
BAHRAICH ...	Behwa	190 14 3	66 2 4	823 0 6	...	...	...	190 14 3	66 2 4	823 0 6	1,080 1 1	...	...
RAE BARELI ...	Tiloi	911 2 0	...	1,390 9 0	...	...	...	911 2 0	...	1,390 9 0	2,301 11 0	...	...
	Bhiragobindpur ...	95 10 6	...	4 7 0	95 10 6	...	...	...	...	4 7 0	4 7 0	...	...
	Pandriganeshpur ...	...	4 6 6	244 2 0	...	4 6 6	...	...	...	244 2 0	244 2 0	...	...
	Balua	363 8 0	...	138 14 9	...	...	...	363 8 0	...	138 14 9	443 9 9	...	58 13 0
UNAO ...	Malauna ...	471 15 0	...	97 7 0	...	...	...	471 15 0	...	97 7 0	569 6 0	...	...
	Gayanpur ...	...	...	15 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	15 2 0	15 2 0	...	...
SULTANPUR ...	Rampur	...	...	1,282 13 1	...	...	...	...	...	1,282 13 1	1,282 13 1	...	...
	Walipur	6 11 6	...	...	...	...	...	6 11 6	...	...	6 11 6	...	...
	Karwar	48 0 0	15 3 2	194 3 9	...	...	61 4 6	48 0 0	15 3 2	132 15 3	195 1 5	1 1 0	...
	Khapradih ...	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
PARTABGARH ...	Bargaon	56 3 0	17 14 3	17 9 3	...	...	...	56 3 0	17 14 3	17 9 3	91 10 6	...	...
	Dahyawan ...	62 13 0	29 15 0	14 5 1	...	...	...	62 13 0	29 15 0	14 5 1	107 1 1	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	21,957 6 0	3,412 3 0	14,815 6 2	502 10 6	1,001 6 2	971 15 0	21,454 11 6	2,410 12 10	13,843 7 2	36,174 4 0	1,454 1 6	80 10 0
	TOTAL, N.-W. P. & OUDH,	65,052 11 8	12,548 8 1	31,433 0 2	1,294 3 3	1,044 1 4	1,468 0 8	63,758 8 0	11,504 6 9	29,964 15 11	76,429 14 8	2,528 14 1	26,269 2 2

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by the Court of Wards under decrees of the Court between 1st October, 1892 and 30th September, 1893.*

District.	Estate.	Receipts.	Nature of disbursements. Amount including costs awarded against the Court of Wards in regular suits.	In prosecution.	In defence.	Total.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MUZAFFARNAGAR...	Sambalhera	...	....	273 9 0	...	273 9 0
MEERUT ...	Ram Saran Das	8 2 0	31 8 0	3 12 0	2 0 0	37 4 0
	Murari Lal	142 5 0	...	1 0 0	52 1 5	53 1 5
ETÁWAH ...	Roshangpur	60 0 0	...	15 2 0	....	15 2 0
	Harchandpur	1,522 4 0	...	117 4 0	...	117 4 0
MUTTRA ...	Parshadi Lal	41 0 0	...	8 5 0	...	8 5 0
MAINPURI ...	Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad.	(a)8,531 13 2	74 2 0	304 14 9	85 11 0	464 11 9
BIJNOR ...	Sahanpur	...	...	95 8 0	...	95 8 0
	Anandi	...	322 0 0	...	5 5 3	327 5 3
MORADABAD ...	Mohib Ali Khan... ...	...	...	...	1,417 8 6	1,417 8 6
	Anand Sarup	...	...	3 5 0	...	3 5 0
	Moharik Husain... ...	...	...	...	50 0 0	50 0 0
	Ahmadyar Khan... ...	...	...	...	162 8 0	162 8 0
BAREILLY ...	Mohan Singh	...	...	58 2 0	...	58 2 0
	Mashuk Mahal Begam ...	...	...	321 4 0	5 5 3	326 9 3
	Madhopur	...	940 15 0	2,363 1 6	1,153 9 9	4,457 10 3
	Hari Singh	...	...	124 5 0	...	124 5 0
SHÁHJAHÁNPUR ...	Azizganj	...	...	16 7 9	...	16 7 9
	Bamrauli	300 0 0	...	58 12 6	...	58 12 6
	Khirya	90 1 4	...	...	126 0 0	126 0 0
	Murli Khera	41 0 0	...	27 2 0	...	27 2 0
FATEHPUR ...	Kasimpur	...	...	...	555 10 3	555 10 3
ALLAHABAD ...	Raghuraj Singh	...	...	...	24 0 0	24 0 0
	B. Bindeshri Parshad ...	66 11 0	...	...	...	...
	Confiscated Estates	...	...	...	20 12 3	20 12 3
	Bara	3,712 11 6	...	242 3 0	...	242 3 0
BÁNDA ...	Ganesh Singh	131 8 0	...	...	98 3 0	98 3 0
CAWNPORE ...	Janki Parshad	1,090 6 0	1,280 5 0	36 7 9	18 1 0	1,348 13 9
	Misri Lal	18 5 0	...	8 6 0	...	8 6 0
	Amar Nath	...	...	...	145 5 6	145 5 6
AZAMGARH ...	Saral Mir	51 14 0	...	...	18 8 3	18 8 3
BASTI ...	Fida Husain	...	...	256 3 0	...	256 3 0
PILIBHÍT ...	Ghunchai	33 15 3	...	19 14 10	351 11 6	371 10 6
GHÁZIPUR ...	Gauri Shankar	884 0 0	...	28 3 3	...	28 3 3
GORAKHPUR ...	Majhauli	34 12 6	1,733 13 9	...	...	1,733 13 9
	B. Sikhir Chand... ...	1,085 0 0	...	...	56 11 3	56 11 3
	Choumakha	...	...	...	2 6 6	2 6 6
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...	17,844 12 9	4,391 11 9	4,883 4 4	4,351 6 8	13,126 6 9
	OUDH.					
BARA BANKI ...	Pokhra	21 2 6	4 5 0	43 5 3	15 7 6	63 1 9
	Mailaraiganj	111 13 0	...	217 0 9	206 10 9	423 11 6
	Narauli	...	236 13 0	750 10 9	2,739 9 3	3,727 1 0
	Bhilwal	...	11 12 0	52 12 6	54 2 3	118 10 9
	Raunsgar	622 8 0	7,085 15 11	987 3 3	612 8 3	8,685 11 5
	Akhyapur	...	...	...	165 4 0	165 4 0
	Surajpur	1,488 14 9	282 4 0	847 12 9	1,912 6 0	3,042 6 9
	Kharka	18 4 0	19 0 0	44 4 3	117 14 9	181 3 0
	Tanda	...	203 8 0	12 6 3	361 2 9	597 1 6
	Bishunpur	...	153 8 0	3 0 0	28 11 0	183 3 0
HARDOI ...	Khajurahra	...	...	4 5 6	30 15 9	35 5 3
KHERI ...	Khairigarh	4,035 13 7	79 5 0	525 0 9	428 9 0	1,032 14 9
	Mullanpur	702 4 0	...	19 9 3	91 0 6	110 9 9
	Kaimahra	417 0 0	...	17 5 3	11 14 9	29 4 0
	Akbarpur	86 4 0	...	32 3 3	18 2 0	50 5 3
SITAPUR ...	Bahora	...	...	3 14 6	148 0 0	152 4 6
	Rajehra	...	...	10 3 9	...	10 3 9
	Musepur	7,751 3 6	3,980 0 0	841 4 0	73 3 0	4,894 7 0
FYZABAD ...	Khapradih	815 6 3	...	731 1 0	222 12 9	958 13 9
	Karwar	224 3 0	...	284 6 0	...	284 6 0
BAHRAICH ...	Rehwa	(b)858 14 2	121 6 0	116 14 0	3 14 0	242 2 9
RAE BARELI ...	Bhiragobindpur	...	...	26 2 6	7 0 0	33 2 6
	Pandrigaonshpur ...	...	...	104 12 9	222 9 6	327 6 3
	Sahuá	10 0 0	...	69 14 0	...	69 14 0
	Binohra	89 11 0	...	14 12 0	...	14 12 0
	Tiloi	409 2 3	56 10 0	1,011 4 6	50 6 0	1,117 4 6
UNAO ...	Madarnagar	...	...	...	235 13 9	235 13 9
	Malauna	...	...	56 1 3	154 8 0	210 9 3
	Gayanpur	...	...	...	168 2 8	168 2 8
SULTÁNPUR ...	Wallpur	9 12 0	...	2 6 0	...	2 6 0
	Karwar	215 7 3	...	210 0 0	10 3 0	220 9 0
	Rampur	1,114 4 3	...	746 0 0	58 7 0	804 7 0
PARTÁBGARH ...	Bargaon	8 5 0	...	17 9 3	2,000 0 0	2,017 9 3
	Dahyawan	...	...	13 2 9	...	13 2 9
	Total, Oudh ...	18,570 4 6	12,233 7 5	7,817 2 0	10,167 12 2	30,218 6 4
	TOTAL, N.-W. P. & OUDH ...	36,415 1 3	16,625 3 2	12,200 7 1	14,519 2 10	43,344 13 1

(a) Not in cash but by purchase of a village by the Estate.
(b) Of this amount Rs. 145-2-2, were realized without execution of decree and are not accounted for in Statement IV(I).

APPENDIX D.

Classification of suits and miscellaneous proceedings instituted by or against the State, Municipal Boards, and Courts of Wards, during the year ending the 30th September 1893.

	Total.	Decisions.								Pending.		
		No.	Favourable.		No.	Unfavourable.		No.	Compromised or withdrawn			
			Rs.	a. p.		Rs.	a. p.		Rs.	a. p.	Rs.	a. p.
Class I.—Suits arising out of relations created by contracts.												
High Court	2	2	9,254	0 0	...	..		..	...		..	
District Courts of appeal ..	2	...	...		...	...		...	...		2	712 0 0
Original suits ...	10	3	164	11 3	...	...		4	60	12 7	3	556 9 0
Total ...	14	5	9,418	11 3	...	..		4	60	12 7	5	1,268 9 0
Class I (a).—To recover money or property due under a contract.												
High Court	13	2	1,940	13 9	1	0,000	0 0	...	...		10	48,378 12 5
District Courts of appeal ...	18	6	2,366	0 9	4	11,541	8 0	..	...		8	12,448 9 8
Original suits	66	37	1,56,279	0 4	6	11,605	12 6	6	9,089	12 6	17	81,052 10 11½
Total ...	95	45	1,60,586	14 10	11	29,207	4 6	6	9,089	12 6	33	1,41,880 0 7½
Class I (b).—For damages arising from breach of contract.												
High Court	...	...	...		...	...		...	...		...	..
District Courts of appeal ...	...	...	...		...	...		...	...		...	...
Original suits ...	6	5	2,024	8 0	.	...		...	...		1	No value.
Total ...	6	5	2,024	8 0	.	...		..	...		1	No value.
Class I (c).—To enforce specific performance of contract.												
High Court	1	...	...		...	...		...	...		1	44,917 0 0
District Courts of appeal ...	...	...	...		...	...		...	...		...	...
Original suits	2	2	1,06,976	8 0	...	...		...	...		...	...
Total ...	3	2	1,06,976	8 0	..	...		...	.		1	44,917 0 0
Class II.—To recover damages on account of torts.												
High Court	2	...	...		1	5,798	0 0	...	...		1	1,00,000 0 0
District Courts of appeal ...	4	...	...		2	3,630	7 0	...	...		2	2,511 2 0
Original suits	19	7	1,00,995	8 9	1	431	7 6	5	97,413	8 1	6	4,913 12 6
Total ...	25	7	1,00,995	8 9	4	9,868	14 6	5	97,413	8 1	9	1,07,424 14 6
Class III.—For redemption or foreclosure of property.												
High Court	2	1	5,151	7 6	...	...		...	...		1	7,448 15 7
District Courts of appeal ...	2	...	...		...	...		...	...		2	1,752 8 6
Original suits	3	2	1,685	8 4	1	2,433	5 4½	...	...		...	...
Total ...	7	3	6,836	15 10	1	2,433	5 4½	...	...		3	9,201 8 1
Class IV.—For declaration of right to, or for possession of, real property.												
High Court	27	7	59,312	10 2	5	11,393	14 3	...	.		12	5,47,652 9 3
District Courts of appeal ...	45	26	6,045	11 3	5	341	9 8	.	...		17	12,689 8 9
Original suits	102	40	1,44,700	14 0	28	4,12,669	10 6	11	8,357	4 0	28	2,66,342 13 8
Total ...	174	73	2,10,059	3 5	..	4,24,405	2 5	11	8,357	4 0	57	8,26,684 15 8
Class V.—Suits under the Land Rent Acts.												
High Court	...	...	...		...	...		...	...		...	..
District Courts of appeal ...	4	2	990	11 0	1	67	0 0	...	...		1	128 6 8
Original suits ...	11	7	769	0 9	...	...		...	...		4	718 4 3
Total ...	15	9	1,759	11 9	1	67	0 0	...	...		5	846 10 11
Class VI.—To declare a personal right.												
High Court	...	...	...		...	...		...	...		...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	1	1	25	0 0	...	...		...	...		...	...
Original suits ..	2	2	530	0 0	.	...		...	...		...	...
Total ...	3	3	555	0 0	...	...		..			...	...
Class VII.—To set aside sales by, or orders of, a Civil Court.												
High Court	...	...	..		...	...		...	...		...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	1	...	...		...	...		...	...		1	5,821 8 3
Original suits	1	...	...		1	3,326	0 0	.	.		...	
Total	2	...	...		1	3,326	0 0	...	...		1	5,821 8 3
Class VIII.—To set aside acts or orders passed by officers of Government.												
High Court	...	...	...		...	...		...	...		...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	1	1	20	0 0	...	...		...	...		...	...
Original suits .	13	3	1,980	8 3	3	138	0 0	5	100	0 0	2	175 0 0
Total ...	14	4	1,800	8 3	3	138	0 0	5	100	0 0	2	175 0 0
Class IX.—Compensation for land acquired for public purposes.												
High Court	...	...	...		...	...		...	...		...	..
District Courts of appeal ...	...	...	...		...	...		.	...		...	...
Original suits ...	2	2	1,857	3 8½	.	.		..	..		...	...
Total ...	2	2	1,857	3 8½	...	...		..	.		...	...
Class X.—Applications for the execution of decrees.												
High Court	1	1	102	3 0	..	..		...	...		...	..
District Courts of appeal .	...	...	...		...	...		...	...		...	...
Original suits ..	114	54	29,889	7 10½	14	11,673	2 11	2	22,456	6 7	44	78,629 2 7
Total ...	115	55	30,051	10 10½	14	11,678	2 11	2	22,456	6 7	44	78,629 2 7
Class XI.—Suits under Act XV of 1858, XXVII of 1860, &c.												
High Court	...	.	...		...	...		...	...		...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	...	..	...		...	...		...	...		...	...
Original suits ..	26	10	9,715	14 9	5	27	4 6	1	No value...		10	4,104 8 0
Total ...	26	10	9,715	14 9	5	27	4 6	1	No value...		10	4,104 8 0
Class XII.—References under Act X of 1870, parts III and IV.												
High Court	2	1	...		...	...		...	...		2	No value.
District Courts of appeal ...	1	...	23	5 0	...	...		...	...		...	...
Original suits ...	29	11	23,985	15 8	5	14,300	0 0	...	...		13	32,991 12 4
Total ...	32	12	24,009	4 8	5	14,300	0 0	...	..		15	32,991 12 4
Class XIII.—Miscellaneous.												
High Court	2	2	32,902	0 0	...	...		...	..		...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	5	...	...		...	...		.	...		5	4,323 12 0
Original suits	10	3	1,468	12 0	2	No value ..		.	...		5	33,208 14 0
Total ...	17	5	34,370	12 0	2	No value...		..	..		10	37,532 10 0
GRAND TOTAL ...	550	240	7,01,917	8 1	80	4,95,446	2 2½	84	1,38,077	11 0	196	12,91,478 3 11½

APPENDIX E.

Statement showing progress made during the year ending 30th September 1893 in realizing Government dues in pauper suits in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh.

Division.	District.	Outstanding on 1st October 1892.	Dues for the year under report.	Total.	Recovered.	Expunged.	Total.	Balance on 30th September 1893.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT.	Dehra Dún ...	...	297 8 0	297 8 0	140 0 0	...	140 0 0	157 8 0
	Sahárunpur ...	(a)720 14 0	263 0 0	983 14 0	98 0 0	416 0 0	514 0 0	469 8 0
	Muzaffarnagar ...	0 1 0	...	0 1 0	...	0 1 0	0 1 0	...
	Meerut ...	536 5 0	243 6 0	779 11 0	294 0 0	102 0 0	396 0 0	383 11 0
	Aligarh ...	944 2 0	162 4 0	1,106 6 0	149 4 0	826 2 0	975 6 0	131 0 0
	Total ...	2,201 6 0	966 2 0	3,167 8 0	681 4 0	1,344 9 0	2,025 13 0	1,141 11 0
AGRA.	Muttra ...	1,930 0 0	1,335 0 0	3,265 0 0	194 8 0	...	194 8 0	3,070 8 0
	Agra ...	2,325 13 0	39 13 0	2,365 10 0	971 12 0	0 9 0	972 6 0	1,393 4 0
	Farukhabad ...	1,388 5 0	150 3 0	1,542 8 0	180 4 0	153 8 0	333 12 0	1,208 12 0
	Etah ...	138 6 9	20 14 0	159 4 9	14 11 0	98 5 9	113 0 9	46 4 0
	Mainpuri ...	1,852 14 9	15 0 0	1,867 14 9	...	15 7 0	15 7 0	1,852 7 9
	Total ...	7,630 7 6	1,569 14 0	9,200 5 6	1,861 4 0	267 13 9	1,629 1 9	7,571 3 9
ROHILKHAND.	Bijnor ...	348 0 0	...	348 0 0	347 15 0	...	347 15 0	0 1 0
	Moradabad ...	3,691 5 7	571 4 0	4,262 9 7	112 14 0	351 8 0	464 6 0	3,798 3 7
	Badaun ...	...	105 12 0	105 12 0	75 0 0	...	75 0 0	30 12 0
	Bareilly ...	404 0 0	61 8 0	465 8 0	68 0 0	257 12 0	320 12 0	144 12 0
	Sháhjahánpur ...	37 8 0	277 11 0	315 3 0	133 13 0	0 8 0	134 5 0	180 14 0
	Pilibhit ...	...	67 4 0	67 4 0	3 4 0	20 12 0	24 0 0	43 4 0
	Total ...	4,480 13 7	1,083 7 0	5,564 4 7	736 14 0	630 8 0	1,366 6 0	4,197 14 7
ALLAHABAD.	Cawnpore ...	1,881 6 0	237 8 0	2,118 14 0	192 6 0	...	192 6 0	1,926 8 0
	Fatehpur ...	221 10 0	23 2 0	244 12 0	15 15 0	136 6 0	152 5 0	92 7 0
	Jalaun ...	150 0 0	150 0 0	300 0 0	...	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0
	Allahabad ...	6,630 8 0	313 15 8	6,944 7 8	828 10 0	713 8 8	1,541 13 8	5,402 10 0
	Jhánsi ...	197 14 8	123 4 4	321 2 7	185 0 0	91 2 7	276 2 7	45 0 0
	Total ...	9,081 6 8	847 13 7	9,929 3 10	1,221 15 0	1,090 11 10	2,312 10 10	7,616 9 0
BENARES.	Jaunpur ...	6,204 2 4	4,102 10 0	10,306 12 4	640 11 3	4,581 1 10	5,221 13 1	5,084 15 3
	Mirzapur ...	106 8 9	927 0 0	1,033 8 9	291 3 7	85 10 2	376 13 9	716 11 0
	Benares ...	1,451 10 0	550 7 0	2,002 1 0	73 2 0	...	73 2 0	1,928 15 0
	Gházipur ...	1,485 6 0	1,923 7 2	3,358 13 2	161 2 6	...	161 2 6	3,197 10 8
	Ballia ...	(b)803 9 0	61 9 0	365 2 0	3 14 0	227 2 6	231 0 6	134 1 6
	Total ...	9,561 4 1	7,565 1 2	17,126 5 3	1,170 1 4	4,893 14 6	6,063 15 10	11,062 5 5
GORAKHPUR.	Gorakhpur ...	72 8 0	248 6 0	320 14 0	178 6 0	72 8 0	250 14 0	70 0 0
	Azamgarh ...	1,199 6 6	81 4 6	1,280 11 0	101 12 0	563 2 0	664 14 0	615 13 0
	Basti ...	3 7 0	63 8 0	66 15 0	66 15 0	...	66 15 0	...
	Total ...	1,275 5 6	393 2 6	1,668 8 0	347 1 0	635 10 0	982 11 0	685 13 0
KUMAUN.	Garhwál ...	62 4 0	...	62 4 0	7 8 0	...	7 8 0	54 12 0
	Total ...	62 4 0	...	62 4 0	7 8 0	...	7 8 0	54 12 0
	Total, N.-W. P. ...	34,292 14 11	12,425 8 3	46,718 7 2	5,524 15 4	8,863 3 1	14,388 2 5	32,330 4 9
	OUDH.							
LUCKNOW.	Lucknow ...	716 6 0	740 4 9	1,456 10 9	347 15 9	981 11 0	1,329 10 9	127 0 0
	Rae Bareli ...	24 4 0	1,184 5 3	1,208 9 3	47 10 0	1,128 1 3	1,175 11 3	32 14 0
	Sitapur ...	598 13 3	354 12 0	953 9 3	93 3 0	593 10 0	686 13 0	266 12 3
	Hardoi ...	16 10 0	62 4 0	78 14 0	62 4 0	...	62 4 0	16 10 0
	Kheri ...	...	85 0 0	85 0 0	85 0 0	...	85 0 0	...
	Total ...	1,356 1 3	2,426 10 0	3,782 11 3	636 0 9	2,703 6 3	3,339 7 0	443 4 3
FYZABAD.	Fyzabad ...	(c)195 1 9	175 15 3	371 1 0	110 8 2	31 9 4	142 1 6	228 15 6
	Bahraich ...	2,928 10 9	1,721 10 0	4,650 4 9	...	3 10 9	3 10 9	4,646 10 0
	Gonda ...	980 9 9	426 8 3	1,387 2 0	103 11 6	242 3 0	345 14 6	1,041 3 6
	Bara Banki ...	27 8 0	112 2 0	139 10 0	85 2 0	27 8 0	112 10 0	27 0 0
	Sultánpur ...	99 5 9	187 6 0	286 11 9	106 0 0	75 6 9	181 6 9	105 5 0
	Partábgarh ...	239 1 3	14 0 0	253 1 3	3 2 0	11 0 0	14 2 0	238 15 3
	Total ...	4,450 5 3	2,637 9 6	7,087 14 9	408 7 8	391 5 10	799 13 6	6,288 1 3
	Total, Oudh ...	5,806 6 6	5,064 3 6	10,870 10 0	1,044 8 5	3,094 12 1	4,139 4 6	6,731 5 6
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh.	40,099 5 5	17,489 11 9	57,589 1 2	6,569 7 9	11,957 15 2	18,527 6 11	39,061 10 3

(a) One anna was wrongly included by Collector last year.
(b) Three pies were ditto ditto.
(c) Deputy Commissioner says that Rs. 0-1-0 was wrongly included last year.

ORDERS OF GOVERNMENT.

No. $\frac{666}{\text{VII—053B}}$ OF 1894.

FROM

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

N.-W. PROVINCES AND OUDH,

TO

THE LEGAL REMEMBRANCER TO GOVERNMENT,

N.-W. PROVINCES AND OUDH.

DATED NAINI TAL, THE 3RD JULY 1894.

SIR,

JUDICIAL DEPT. (CIVIL).

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. $\frac{2772}{568}$, dated 11th May 1894, being the report on the litigation in which the State, Municipal Boards and the Court of Wards were concerned during the year ended on 30th September 1893. The report is due on the 15th May and was not received in the Secretariat till 11th June 1894. The Hon'ble Mr. Deas held charge of the office of Legal Remembrancer during the whole of the year under report, with the exception of three months, during which the Hon'ble Mr. Thornton acted for him.

2. The statements appended to the report have been rendered much more intelligible by the addition of foot-notes distinguishing references under the Land Acquisition Act and execution of decree cases, and it has now become possible to ascertain the number and value of ordinary suits and proceedings which were before the Courts during the year. The statements still, however, admit of improvement, and the proposals to that end promised in paragraph 4 of your report will be awaited.

3. *State Litigation.*—The State was the plaintiff in 41 cases before Courts of original jurisdiction during the year. Of these 24 were references under the Land Acquisition Act, in which the amount involved was Rs. 36,154, six were proceedings in execution of decrees valued at Rs. 627, and 11 were ordinary suits and miscellaneous proceedings involving claims valued at Rs. 2,684. The State was successful to the full extent of its claims in all the eight ordinary suits and three execution cases which were decided. In references under the Land Acquisition Act the compensation proposed by the Collector was accepted by the Courts in ten cases and modified in five cases. Nine references were pending at the close of the year. The State was defendant in 62 cases of which 44 were disposed of. The plaintiff was unsuccessful in 21 of these (value Rs. 1,22,512), three (value Rs. 200) were compromised, ten were withdrawn, and in ten decrees were given against the State. The total amount claimed in the ten suits in which decrees were given against the State was Rs. 3,67,186. The suit in which Inayat-ullah claimed right to possession and offerings at the shrine of

Saiyid Salar in the Bahraich District, was decreed in favour of the plaintiff by the Sub-Judge. It is presumed that the sum shown in the appendices as decreed (Rs. 1,00,007) is the value of past income of the shrine and that the rest of the value of the claim (Rs. 2,54,993) represents the capital value. The other cases lost were unimportant except that against the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway administration at Moradabad. It is observed that the Legal Remembrancer recommended a compromise, and that in opposition to his advice the railway administration has appealed the case to the High Court.

4. In district Courts of appeal the State appeared as appellant in four cases. Three were decided, two against and one in favour of the appellant. Of the 12 appeals in which the State was respondent 11 were decided during the year, one only being decreed against the State. Two cases were decided in the High Court, both adversely to the State.

5. *Municipal Litigation.*—Benares again appears as the most litigious municipality. Out of 12 decided original suits brought by Municipal Boards 10 were from Benares, and four suits brought by the same Municipality were pending at the close of the year. All twelve suits were decided in favour of the plaintiffs. In cases in which Municipal Boards were defendants eight were successfully contested and six were lost. Five were compromised. Of the six cases decided adversely to the Boards three, which were lost in Lucknow, had not been reported to your office. All the appeals (10) decided in district Courts in which municipalities were concerned were in favour of the Boards. One appeal was won and one lost in the High Court. In the latter the Jaunpur Municipality appealed contrary to your predecessor's advice.

6. *Court of Wards' Litigation.*—The following tables exhibit the statistics for Courts of first instance of this important branch of the litigation under your supervision. Suits compromised or withdrawn are omitted:—

Court of Wards Plaintiff.

	Number of suits decided.	Number decreed.	Total value of claims.	Amount decreed.
			Rs.	Rs.
North-Western Provinces ...	12	10 or 83·3%	36,388	3,879 or 10·6%
Oudh	25	22 or 88%	25,451	11,189 or 43·9%
Total ...	37	32 or 86·5%	61,839	15,068 or 24·3%

Court of Wards Defendant.

	Number of suits decided.	Number dismissed.	Total value of claims.	Amount decreed.
			Rs.	Rs.
North-Western Provinces ...	17	16 or 94·1%	3,54,350	48 or ·001%
Oudh	34	23 or 67·6%	44,434	25,340 or 57%
Total ...	51	39 or 76·5%	4,98,784	25,388 or 6·4%

The percentage of suits decided in favour of the Court of Wards was higher than in 1892, when the proportion was 80·2 per cent. of suits in which the Court of Wards was plaintiff and 60 3 per cent. of suits in which the Court of Wards was defendant. The low percentage of amount decreed to the total claim in cases instituted by the Court of Wards, North-Western Provinces, is due to the small value of the suits won (Rs. 4,314) and to the loss of a suit, valued at Rs. 32,000, brought by the Madhopur Estate to oust a person whose possession of a village and other valuable property was believed, but was not proved to the satisfaction of the Judge, to be fraudulent. In the Oudh cases in which suits were filed on behalf of the estates the smallness of the amounts decreed appears to be mainly due to failure to fully substantiate claims of Rs. 9,461 in the Khairigarh Estate and Rs. 9,815 in the Musepur Estate, decrees being obtained for Rs. 1,032 and Rs. 5,960 respectively. It is possible that the result of these two suits is really more favourable than these figures appear to indicate.

7. In the North-Western Provinces the Madhopur, Janki Parshad, and Mohib Ali Khan estates successfully resisted claims valued at Rs. 1,06,800, Rs. 1,13,150, and Rs. 1,25,000 respectively, of which no details are given in your report. In Oudh most of the suits brought against estates were of small value. The principal case decided adversely to the Court of Wards was that of Khadim Muhammad *versus* the Madarnagar Estate and another, in which Rs. 21,967 was decreed. This case appears to have been reported to your office too late for it to be possible for the Legal Remembrancer to assist in the defence, which, with the sanction of the Board of Revenue, was left in the hands of the co-defendant. Of the cases shown as compromised the most important was that against the Ghunchai Estate in the Pilibhit District described on page 13 of your report. There appears to be no doubt that Mr. Conlan exercised a wise discretion in coming to terms.

8. In miscellaneous proceedings (principally applications for execution of decrees) the Court of Wards as plaintiff won 50 out the 63 cases which were decided during the year. Another application had to be withdrawn as no property of the judgment-debtor could be found upon which to take proceedings. In 16 similar completed proceedings in which the estates were defendants seven claims were successfully contested. About half the amount claimed was awarded against the Court of Wards. You observe that the return of cases lost as shown in Statement I*(a)* is misleading, as some of the applications were only rejected for the time being and can be revived on a suitable opportunity occurring. The proposals which you are about to submit should deal with this matter with a view to rendering the appendices to your report self-explanatory.

9. In district Courts of appeal the Court of Wards was a party to 23 decided cases. As appellants the estates were successful in three out of four cases and as respondents in 11 out of 19. Of those shown as lost four of the more important are pending in second appeal before the Judicial Commissioner and another was remanded for re-trial and had

not been disposed of at the end of the year. In the High Court, &c., 13 out of 18 decided appeals were won and four lost, and in one case in which the Court of Wards was appellant a remand was ordered. On the whole, therefore, the result of the litigation undertaken by the Court of Wards may be considered satisfactory. In paragraph 31 of your report you show that 75 per cent. of all the proceedings disposed of before Courts of all grades resulted in favour of the estates concerned.

10. The following table exhibits the state of the realisations of dues under all heads as compared with the figures of the previous year:—

	Total demand, 1892-93.	Realised, 1892-93.	Percentage realised, 1892-93.	Percentage realised, 1891-92.
State.	Rs.	Rs.		
North-Western Provinces	19,206	1,657	8·6	11·0
Oudh	1,835	1,364	74·3	1·4
Total ...	21,041	3,021	14·3	10·0
Municipalities.				
North-Western Provinces	5,905	862	14·5	10·6
Oudh	20	20	100·	...
Total ...	5,925	882	14·8	10·6
Court of Wards.				
North-Western Provinces	86,694	17,845	20·5	16·6
Oudh	58,610	18,425	31·4	40·6
Total ...	1,45,304	36,270	24·9	27·5
GRAND TOTAL ...	1,72,270	40,173	23·3	25·1

11. The general result is therefore not quite so favourable as in the preceding year. The diminished success in the realisation of sums decreed is due to small realisations of State and municipal dues in the North-Western Provinces and to the large balances due to the Court of Wards in Oudh. The largest balances due to the State were in Etah (Rs. 2,544), Allahabad (Rs. 2,105) and Agra (Rs. 886). The major part of the two former amounts is reported to be recoverable and the latter sum irrecoverable. Of municipalities, Cawnpore and Benares show the largest balances, over which, however, you, as Legal Remembrancer, have little control. Of the Court of Wards' balances Rs. 2,529 are irrecoverable and Rs. 26,269 doubtful, but it appears that active steps are being taken for the recovery of the remainder.

12. *Recovery of Government dues in pauper suits.*—The balance outstanding at the commencement of the year was Rs. 40,100. In addition Rs. 17,489 became due during 1892-93, making a total of Rs. 57,589 for collection. In all Rs. 6,569 was realised during the year and Rs. 11,958 written off as irrecoverable, as against Rs. 5,052 and Rs. 16,155 respectively in the preceding year. The balance remaining on 1st October 1893 for realisation was Rs. 39,062.

I have the honor to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

T. W. HOLDERNESS,

Secy. to Govt., N.-W. P. and Oudh.